

EQUITY AND LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY, 18, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.

Whole-world policies in most cases free of charge.
Policies indisputable and unconditional.

SPECIMEN BONUSES.

Actual additions made to Policies of £1,000 effected under Tables I. and II.

Age at Entry.	NUMBER OF PREMIUMS PAID.				
	Five.	Ten.	Twenty.	Thirty.	Forty.
20	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.
30	103 0	191 10	431 0	*736 0	*1,092 0
40	112 0	211 0	464 10	*810 0	*1,167 0
50	124 0	232 0	526 10	*939 10	*1,343 10
60	147 0	276 10	*626 10	*1,126 0
60	197 10	372 0	*836 10

EXAMPLE.—A Policy for £1,000, effected 30 years ago by a person then aged 30, would have increased to £1,819, or by more than 80 per cent.

In the cases marked * the Bonuses, if surrendered, would be more than sufficient to extinguish all future premiums, and the Policy-holders would still be entitled to share in future profits.

Cases Reported this Week.

In the Solicitors' Journal.

(Before the Vacation Judge.)

Beaumont v. Provident Assurance Co. (Lim.)	698
Coromandel Gold Co. (Lim.), Re	698
Moore v. Malyon	699
Wainman, Re, Peake v. Wainman	698
West Indian Gold Mining Corporation (Lim.), Re	698
Weyman v. Mason	699

In the Weekly Reporter.

Deane, In re, Bridger v. Deane	786
--------------------------------	-----

De Burgh Lawson, In re, De Burgh Lawson	797
Doering v. Doering	796
Lidiard's Contract, In re	793
Longbottom v. Shaw	792
Mitchell v. Simpson	793
Myerson West Gold Mining Co. (Limited), In re	794
Price v. Manning	785
Quirk, In re, Quirk v. Quirk	796
Reg. v. Barnardo	789
Smith v. Wood	800
Union Plate Glass Co. (Limited), In re	792

VOL. XXXIII., No. 44.

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, AUGUST 31, 1889.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE ORDER for transfer of eighty actions to Mr. Justice KEKEWICH, which was referred to in these columns as about to be made, was signed on the 22nd inst., and will be found printed elsewhere. A list of the transferred cases, arranged in the order in which they will come into the paper, which is added at the foot of the order, will be found useful.

ON THE SECOND DAY of the Vacation Sittings Mr. Baron POLLOCK, having before him a list of forty-five matters, had travelled through the whole of the list by a little before five o'clock, and, although all the cases in the list were not disposed of, the majority of those which stood over were not so dealt with by reason of the judge being unable or unwilling to dispose of them. Several petitions for the winding up of companies have by special leave been answered for the 4th and the 11th of September.

THE DECISION arrived at by the Home Secretary in the case of Mrs. MAYBRICK was in accordance with general expectation, but it was inevitable that it should evoke hostile criticism from two opposite points of view. One of the most absurd objections which has been made to the commutation of the sentence is, that it is in effect a verdict of guilty of attempting to murder, and that the prisoner was never put on her trial for that particular offence, but those who have adduced this argument are, no doubt, ignorant of the express provision contained in 14 & 15 Vict. c. 100, s. 9, that "if on the trial of any person charged with any felony or misdemeanour it shall appear to the jury upon the evidence that the defendant did not complete the offence charged, but that he was guilty only of an attempt to commit the same, such person shall not by reason thereof be entitled to be acquitted, but the jury shall be at liberty to return as their verdict that the defendant is not guilty of the felony or misdemeanour charged, but is guilty of an attempt to commit the same." The offence of attempting to commit murder is dealt with in the earlier part of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100), and section 11 provides that

"whosoever shall administer to or cause to be administered to any person any poison . . . shall be guilty of felony "punishable with penal servitude for life or for any shorter term, or imprisonment for not less than two years," while by section 15 an attempt to commit murder "by any means other than those specified in any of the preceding sections" is also a felony, and is similarly punishable.

THE RECENT agitation in the MAYBRICK case has had the effect of obtaining from Mr. MATTHEWS promises to consider, during the recess, the question of introducing two measures for dealing with criminal procedure—namely, the establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal, and the settlement of a rule as to admitting voluntary statements by prisoners; but he might more advantageously have pledged himself to secure the passing of the Bill which has been introduced in several successive sessions for the purpose of rendering accused persons competent witnesses in all cases, and thus getting rid of the anomalies from time to time introduced by the Legislature in admitting such evidence in the case only of certain particular offences. This measure is at once more pressing and more practicable than the establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal, and the question is far more ripe for settlement. The passing of the Bill would also dispose of the other question which the Home Secretary undertook to consider, since it would deprive of all weight and relevancy the unsworn statements, whether made through counsel or otherwise, of prisoners who may elect not to be examined as witnesses.

A QUESTION of evidence in connection with the procedure in proving questions of foreign law was raised before the Court of Appeal in the cases of *Concha v. Murieta* and *De Mora v. Concha* (40 Ch. D. 543). The court had to ascertain the law of Peru with reference to a father's right to administer the estate of his infant child. Contradictory affidavits by two experts in Peruvian law were produced by the respective parties, both referring to various passages in the Civil Code of Peru. It was contended that, questions of foreign law being issues of fact, the court could only consider the statements made by the experts, and could not examine for themselves the provisions of the Peruvian Code. *Lord Nelson v. Lord Bridport* (8 Beav. 527) was relied upon as shewing that no knowledge of foreign law is to be imputed to an English court. The court, however, held that they were at liberty to ascertain for themselves the meaning of the passages in the code to which the experts had referred them. Lord Justice COTTON laid down that, while foreign law is a question of fact to be decided by advocates practising in the courts of the country the law of which is in issue, if the experts refer to passages in the code of that country, it would be unreasonable not to permit the court to look at those passages so as to ascertain their proper meaning. He based this ruling on the authority of *Bremer v. Freeman* (17 Moo. P. C. 306), where the Privy Council looked at and examined the decisions of certain foreign courts in order to decide a question of foreign testamentary law. Lord Justice LOPES more briefly laid down the law that if an expert witness states that "any text-book, decision, code, or other legal document" truly represents the law of a foreign country, the court may regard such document, "not as evidence *per se*, but as part of the testimony of the witness," and may give the same effect to it as to the rest of his evidence.

IN VIEW of the extensive strikes now prevailing in London it may be of interest to refer to the law as to picketing contained in the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1875 (38 & 39 Vict. c. 86) which was passed by the present Lord CROSS when Home Secretary. Section 7 enacts that whoever, "with a view to compel any other person to abstain from doing or to do any act which such other person has a right to do or abstain from doing, wrongfully and without legal authority (1) uses violence to or intimidates such person, or his wife or children, or injures his property, or (2) persistently follows such other person about from place to place, or (3) hides any tools, clothes, or other property owned or used by such other person, or deprives or hinders him in the use thereof, or (4) watches or besets the house or other place where such other person resides, or works, or carries on business, or happens to be at the approach to such house or place, or (5) follows such other person with two or more other persons in a disorderly

manner in or through any street or road," is to be punishable, either summarily or on indictment, with fine or imprisonment. The section further provides that "attending at or near the house or place where a person resides, or works, or carries on business, or happens to be, or the approach to such house or place, in order merely to obtain or communicate information," is not to be deemed "a watching or besetting," within the section; and section 3 provides that "an agreement or combination by two or more persons to do or procure to be done any act in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute shall not be indictable as a conspiracy if such act committed by one person would not be punishable as a crime." The most serious offences hitherto reported, the stoppage of wagons of coals and other goods when being driven from the wharves, are of course not covered by either of the above provisos, but have been dealt with by the magistrates as acts of intimidation under section 7 of the Act.

In re Ebsworth and Tidy's Contract (37 W. R. 657) is a good example of the importance which the stricter judges still attach to the exact devolution of the legal estate. Property which had been contracted to be sold had, by a previous owner, been mortgaged to the trustees of a building society with a power, upon default by the mortgagor, for the trustees, when required by the director, to sell and dispose thereof. The society having been wound up, six of the directors were appointed official liquidators, and it was declared that all the acts required by the Companies Act of 1862 to be done by the official liquidators might be done by any two of them. An order was also made vesting all the property of the society in the liquidators. Subsequently two of them sold the property in question and executed the conveyance. In the present transaction various objections were taken to the title, and amongst them the objection that the conveyance by the two liquidators was not sufficient to pass the whole legal estate, and that four-sixths of it was still outstanding. The result shows the continued prevalence of the scholastic theory of the legal estate, which regards it as an entity residing in the owner, only to be got out of him by an actual conveyance, although, of course, all that is really necessary is to make sure that the collection of rights which constitutes ownership has ceased with regard to the old owner and has become vested in the new one. The former view was adopted by COTTON and FRY, L.J.J., and therefore prevailed in this particular instance; and, indeed, there is no doubt that it is still the law. The entity, known as the legal estate, was vested in the six liquidators, and nothing that two of these were empowered to do could get it out of them and vest it in a purchaser without the active concurrence of the rest. "Acts of Parliament," said COTTON, L.J., "have not yet come to regard the conveyance of the legal estate as a mere act of form, and I certainly cannot so regard it, as I fear the Master of the Rolls is inclined to do." The Master of the Rolls, indeed, treated the matter in the freer way which is characteristic of him. As we have stated, any two of the liquidators were to have the statutory powers of the whole body. These include, under section 95, a power to sell the real property of the company and also a power to transfer it. To say then, said Lord ESHER, that they had power to transfer, and yet not to convey, was to his mind the merest shadow of a shadow imaginable, and such could not have been the intention of the Legislature. Probably not; but it is then also probable that the Legislature was not contemplating the mysteries of the legal estate at all. If the time had yet come when these could be neglected, Lord ESHER's judgment would be right, but such is by no means the case. An owner in whom the legal estate is vested must in all cases himself get rid of it in proper legal form, unless an Act of Parliament has expressly provided that this may be done in some other manner.

In *Bright v. Campbell* (37 W. R. 745), Mr. Justice KAY followed the rule that, where a mortgage deed contains a provision for reduction of interest on punctual payment, and the mortgagee is subsequently obliged to enter into possession, he is entitled, nevertheless, to charge the higher rate of interest. The argument on the other side, of course, is that the mortgagee receives the rents, and out of them can pay himself the interest punctually; but this was rejected by JESSEL, M.R., in *Union Bank of London v. Ingram* (29 W. R. 209, 16 Ch. D. 53), on the ground, mainly, that the rents in the hands of the mortgagee do not represent interest as such,

but simply the produce of the estate, and in taking the accounts they are placed on one side together with any other receipts there may happen to be; while, on the other, the mortgagee is credited with principal and interest. In face, however, of the fact that in taking the accounts of a mortgagee in possession his receipts are really applied first in payment of interest, there appears to be a certain amount of special pleading in this way of putting the matter, unless it be further supported by the consideration that a mortgagee in possession is by no means certain to receive the rents punctually. At any rate, Mr. Justice KAY said that he should not himself have originated it; but in expressing his dissent from Sir GEORGE JESSEL's decision generally he appears to have overlooked the other ground on which it was based—viz., that there is really no bargain, either in words or in fact, that the mortgagee shall, if he takes possession, be content to accept the lower rate of interest. The proviso, indeed, is framed on the supposition that the mortgagor personally makes the punctual payment, and there is no reason to suppose that it was meant to apply where the mortgagee is driven into the very onerous position of a mortgagee in possession. From this point of view it makes no difference that he does, as a matter of fact, receive sufficient rents from time to time to keep down the interest. However, whether he agreed with the reasoning or not, his lordship felt bound to follow the decision of the late Master of the Rolls, and the mortgagee in the case before him was allowed the higher rate.

THE DECISION of the majority of a court of fourteen judges in *Reg. v. Tolson* (37 W. R. 716, 23 Q. B. D. 168) settles an important question of criminal law, as to the effect, in a prosecution for bigamy, of *bonâ fide* belief, founded upon reasonable grounds, on the part of the accused, that the first husband or wife was dead at the time when the second marriage was contracted. The question was reserved in order to dispose of a doubt which had arisen in consequence of a series of contradictory rulings. The prisoner had been deserted by her husband, and the jury found that she had in good faith and on reasonable grounds believed him to be dead; but he reappeared in England a few months after the second marriage. The period of his absence was less than seven years, so that there could have been no presumption of death, and no ground for applying the proviso in 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 57, that "nothing in this Act shall extend to any person marrying a second time whose husband or wife shall have been continually absent from such person for the space of seven years last past, and shall not have been known by such person to be living before that time." The arguments in support of the conviction were partly founded upon the words of that section, and partly upon the authority of *Reg. v. Prince* (L. R. 2 C. C. R. 154). In that case the prisoner had been convicted under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 160, s. 55, for taking a girl under the age of sixteen out of her father's possession against his will. The girl looked older than sixteen, and the jury found that the prisoner *bonâ fide* believed, and had reasonable ground for believing, that she had reached that age; but the majority of judges held that such belief was no defence to the charge. The arguments in support of the conviction in *Reg. v. Tolson* may be gathered from the judgment of Mr. Justice MANISTY, who delivered the opinion of the minority. He relied on the fact that the statute did not require that the act of bigamy should be committed either "feloniously," or "unlawfully," or even "knowingly," from which he inferred that bigamy was punishable, without regard to the existence of a *mens rea*. He thought that the fact that the statute made bigamy a felony did not affect the case, and he expressed an opinion that an indictment for bigamy would be good without its alleging the accused acted "feloniously"; but he overlooked the case of *Reg. v. Gray* (12 W. R. 350, L. & C. 365), which decided that every indictment for a felony, whether at common law or by statute, must contain the word "feloniously." He was unable to distinguish the case from *Reg. v. Prince*, which had established that a *bonâ fide* and reasonable belief could be no defence to a criminal act, while the special proviso as to the seven years led to the inference that an absence for a shorter period was no answer to a charge of bigamy. Several of the majority of the court delivered judgments, only two of which need be specially noticed. Mr. Justice CAVE observed that at common law "an honest and reasonable belief in the existence of circumstances which, if true, would make the act for which the prisoner is indicted an innocent one" was always a good

defence, such belief standing on the same footing as absence of the reasoning faculty, as in infancy or lunacy; and none of these exceptions were excluded in the case of statutory offences, unless this was done either expressly or by natural implication. It did not follow from *Reg. v. Prince* that "the exception of honest and reasonable mistake" was not applicable to offences of every description, and the statutory exemption from criminal liability in cases where the first husband or wife has not been heard of for seven years was not inconsistent with the general principle that reasonable belief of such person's death is an answer to the charge, even if seven years have not expired since he or she was last heard of. Mr. Justice STEPHEN spoke of the term *mens rea*, as being "misleading" and "confusing," because it has necessarily widely different meanings in the case of different classes of crimes; and he laid down the general rule that an alleged offender is deemed to have acted under that state of facts which he in good faith and on reasonable grounds believed to exist when he did the act. With regard to the contention that the express proviso in 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 27, negated any tacit exception, he held that the proviso merely supplied a rule of evidence to be used, under particular circumstances, in the absence of express proof of death, but did not shew that belief in the first husband's or wife's death was no excuse till the seven years had expired, and mere separation for seven years had the same effect as reasonable belief at an earlier period. *Reg. v. Prince* shewed that an abductor acted at his own risk, but not that a person contracting what he or she believes to be a valid marriage should be liable to undergo seven years' penal servitude. Mr. Justice STEPHEN had to a certain extent anticipated the recent case by expressing an opinion in a Note to Article 34 of his "Digest of the Criminal Law" that the proviso in 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 57, ought not to be read as excluding the common law principle, that "an alleged offender is in general deemed to have acted under that state of facts which he in good faith and on reasonable grounds believed to exist when he did the act alleged to be an offence," but rather as "supplementing and completing it."

THE RIGHT TO THE POSSESSION AND PRODUCTION OF DEEDS.

IV.—(2) THE RIGHT TO PRODUCTION.

Introductory remarks.—It sometimes happens:

- (1) That the title deeds of land are in the possession of a person having a particular estate in the land, in which case they are muniments not only of his title, but also of the title of the persons entitled in remainder or reversion.
- (2) That the deeds are in the possession of one of several persons entitled to the land as joint tenants, tenants in common, or co-parceners, in which case they are muniments of the title of each of them.
- (3) That the deeds are muniments of the title of different parcels of land belonging to different persons.

In each of these cases the person who does not possess the deeds may be entitled to have it produced for the purpose of manifesting his title. This right is an equitable right, and formerly could not be enforced at law. It is called the right to production.

This equitable right of production arises from and is annexed to the ownership of the land, and must be distinguished from rights arising from express contract—i.e., the rights arising under a covenant for production or statutory acknowledgment.

In some of the cases it will be found that the right to the production of a document turns on the form of the pleadings. This right does not arise, except perhaps in some cases indirectly, from the ownership of the land. "Where a party has thought proper to put his defence on a particular document, he himself having introduced it and put it forward, he cannot be permitted to make any representation of it, however unfounded, that he pleases, but the plaintiff is entitled to see whether the defendant has rightly stated it. It is because the defendant has made it part of his answer that the plaintiff is entitled to see it; not because the plaintiff has an interest in it. The principle is that the defendant shall not avail himself of that mode of concealing his defence": *per COTTENHAM, C., Adams v. Fisher* (3 My. & Cr., at p. 549).

In other cases a document has been compelled to be produced where the object of the proceedings was to impeach it for fraud, or to have it reformed.

In this and the following articles we propose to discuss only the equitable right of production arising out of the ownership of the land, and the rights arising out of express covenants for production. It will be found that, with some few exceptions, every person who has an interest in the land has an equitable right to the production of the deeds manifesting his title, the most important exception being that of persons entitled to the equity of redemption to lands mortgaged before 1882; and that, conversely, a person who has no interest in the land has no right to the production of the title deeds.

The following principle will be found to run through all the cases—viz., that on the one hand a person is, with a few exceptions, entitled to the production of all the deeds which affirmatively support his title, and that, on the other hand, he is not entitled to the production of any deeds which do not do so.

We shall, in the first place, shew that a person who has no interest in the land has not any right to the production of the deeds affecting it, and shall then discuss particular instances of the right as exercised by persons having an interest in the land to which the deeds relate.

A stranger cannot compel the production of title deeds.—"It is a very general principle in a court of equity that a person shall not be compellable to produce his title deeds to gratify the curiosity of a person having no estate or interest in the property to which they relate": *per GRAHAM, B., Compton v. Grey* (1 Y. & J., at p. 158).

"Parties are never compelled to produce their title deeds. If a *subpoena duces tecum* is served, the party must bring his deeds into court in obedience to the *subpoena*; but, if he states that they are his title deeds, no judge will ever compel him to produce them": *per Cur., Pickering v. Noyes* (1 B. & C. 262).

"A party has the right to the production of deeds sustaining his own title affirmatively, but not of those which are not immediately connected with the support of his own title and which form part of his adversary's. He cannot call for those which, instead of supporting his own title, defeat it by entitling his adversary. Those under which both claim he may have, or those under which he alone claims": *per BROUGHAM, C., Bolton v. Corporation of Liverpool* (1 My. & K., at p. 91).

See to the same effect *Minet v. Morgan* (L. R. 8 Ch. 361), *Owen v. Wynn* (9 Ch. D. 29), *Sampson v. Suettenham* (5 Mad. 16).

Heir-at-law.—As between the heir-at-law and devisee the heir is not entitled to production. "The title of the heir is a plain one, and is a legal title. All the family deeds together would not make his title better or worse. If he cannot set aside the will he has nothing to do with the deeds. . . . A will established is an answer to an heir-at-law": *per LOUGHBOROUGH, C., Shaftesbury v. Arrowsmith* (4 Ves., at p. 70), cited and approved by GRANT, M.R., *Jones v. Jones* (3 Mer., at p. 172). "An heir-at-law cannot in that character call for the general inspection of deeds in the possession of a devisee": *per BROUGHAM, C., Bolton v. Corporation of Liverpool* (1 My. & K., at p. 91). The rule was even applied in *Bennett v. Glossop* (3 Ha. 578), where the heir-at-law of a *feme covert* claimed against her devisee, alleging the absence of any power of appointment in the *feme covert*, or that it was never duly exercised by her. The only issue raised on the pleadings being the validity of the appointment by the devise, the heir was held not to be entitled to the production of the deeds under which the devisees alleged that the power was created, though it appeared that by such deeds the estate was limited to the heirs of the woman in default of appointment.

In *Collins v. Gresley* (2 Y. & J., at p. 492) ALEXANDER, C.B., said: "As to the case of an heir-at-law seeking a remedy against a will or a recovery, the heir-at-law shewing a *prima facie* title has a right to the production of the anterior title, but not to the subsequent title." It should be observed that the remarks of the Chief Baron were not necessary for the determination of the case; that it is difficult to see how the heir could claim against a recovery, so that there is probably some error in the report; possibly the words should be "heir-in-tail."

In an early case of *Tanner v. Wise* (3 P. Wms. 294) the deeds in the hands of a devisee were ordered into court on the application of the heir pending an ejectment, with liberty to him to inspect them, but this case has not been followed.

There appear to be two exceptional cases in which the heir will be entitled to production:

- (1) Where the heir is unable to make out his title without the aid of some instrument under which the devisee claims: *Bennett v. Glossop* (3 Ha. 578), cited with approval by Wood, V.C., in *Rumbold v. Forteath* (3 K. & J., at p. 751).
- (2) Where the deeds relate to the pedigree of the heir: *Rumbold v. Forteath* (3 K. & J. 748), *Kettlewell v. Barstow* (L. R. 7 Ch. 686).

Heir-in-tail.—The position of the heir-in-tail is very different from that of the heir-at-law. His title does not arise merely from the seisin and death of his ancestor, it arises from the instrument creating the entail. Therefore, he is entitled to production of that instrument. The cases shew that he is also entitled to see the deed creating a tenant to the *præcipe* in preparation for a recovery.

"A will is no answer to an heir-in-tail. . . . An heir-in-tail has, beyond the general right, such an interest in the deed creating the entail that the court, as against the person holding back that deed, would compel the production of it": *per* LOUGHBOROUGH, C., *Shaftesbury v. Arrowsmith* (4 Ves., at p. 71). This is the view adopted in *Bettison v. Farrington* (3 P. Wms 363), though in an earlier case (*Suffolk v. Howard*, 2 P. Wms. 177) an order was made for the production of all the deeds. It is not easy to understand from the report of *Burton v. Neville* (2 Cox, 242), where production was refused, what the deeds were of which the production was refused.

In *Bettison v. Farrington*, the plaintiff was the heir in tail of a remainderman taking by purchase; the principle there laid down will probably be extended to a tenant in tail taking by purchase.

Remainderman.—A vested remainderman is entitled to the production of the title deeds in the possession of the tenant for life to enable him to deal with his reversionary interest: *Reeves v. Reeves* (9 Mod. 128), *Davis v. Dysart* (20 Beav. 405), *Pennell v. Dysart* (27 Beav. 542). It is hardly necessary to say that the assign of the remainderman has the same right: *Davis v. Dysart* (20 Beav. 405). The right does not extend to a remainderman whose title is disputed on reasonable grounds: see *Davis v. Dysart*, *Pennell v. Dysart* (*ubi sup.*). A contingent remainderman appears not to have any right to production: *Noel v. Ward* (1 Madd. 322).

In an early case (*Lempster v. Pomfret*, 1 Amb. 154; s.c. 1 Dick. 238 (where the words "for proper purposes" are omitted)) Lord HARDWICK said:—"If a bill is brought by a son against his father for discovery of deeds, as auxiliary to an action to be brought at law or relief sought in this court, he is entitled to it. So, if for a discovery in order to mortgage for proper purposes, I will not determine whether, in case the son was about marrying, and the father will not discover his settlement and what right the son is entitled to, in that case he ought not to have such discovery." It appears that, if the report in DICKINS is correct, in Lord HARDWICK's opinion the question whether a son entitled in remainder was entitled to production by his father for the purpose of dealing with his estate depended upon whether he wished to deal with his estate for that which the court would consider a proper—i.e., prudent—purpose or not. But this view has not been followed. In cases where (as in *Davis v. Dysart*, 20 Beav. 405) the language "production for a proper purpose" is used, all that it meant is a purpose authorized by law or equity.

An application to the court by a remainderman for production must be for the production of specific deeds, and must state the object for which production is required: *Shaw v. Shaw* (12 Price, 163).

In *Dart's Vendors and Purchasers*, p. 475, 6th ed., it is stated that:—"It is conceived that where, as sometimes happens, A. and B. jointly purchase property, taking the conveyance so as to give to B. merely an estate in remainder, B. has a general right to the production of the muniments of title." This view follows from the principles above laid down, and appears to be correct.

HOW TO PREPARE A DEBTOR'S STATEMENT OF AFFAIRS IN BANKRUPTCY.

CREDITORS FULLY AND PARTLY SECURED.

Lists B. and C., dealing with creditors holding security of some

kind, may be considered together, as they are much alike, and the same remarks apply to both. To constitute a creditor secured as against the debtor's estate, the security must consist of property belonging to the debtor. The guarantee of a third person or the deposit of property belonging to a third person may secure the creditor, but as regards the debtor's estate such creditors are unsecured and must be so treated.

In addition to the particulars required on list A.—i.e., names, addresses, and occupations of creditors, amount of debt when contracted and consideration therefor, on lists B. and C. a statement must be made of the security held by the creditor when such security was given, and the present (at date of receiving order) value thereof. There is a general tendency in debtors to overestimate the realizable value of their property held as security. This is natural, as it makes their affairs appear not quite so bad, and sometimes avoids shewing a deficiency. But reasonably accurate estimates of present value should be insisted upon by anyone making up a statement of affairs. Otherwise more trouble will be incurred at a later date, and an amended statement will likely be required by the official receiver. The value of property at the date when a mortgage or other security was given must be disregarded, and only the present realizable value brought into the account. Depreciation in values can be written off in the deficiency account.

The amount of the debt and the value of the security having been ascertained, it can then be determined whether the creditor should be entered on list B. or list C. All creditors holding security of the estimated value of their debts, or in excess of their debts, must be entered on list B. If the debt and the security are estimated of equal amount there will be no surplus, and the last column of the list B. will be marked "nil" or dotted through in regard to that item. Where the security is of greater value than the debt, the balance in excess will be carried into the last column, which is headed "Estimated Surplus from Security."

Alphabetical order cannot always be adhered to on lists B. and C. as successive charges on the same property should be grouped together in the order in which they were given—such as first, second, or third mortgage. The "particulars of security" need not be elaborate, but should accurately state its nature and situation. Dates are important in proportion to their near relation to the date of the receiving order. If within six months state the exact day if possible. Beyond that period it will be sufficient to name the month and year. Where two charges exist on one property and only the first is considered fully secured, the holder of the first charge will appear on list B., and the holder of the second on list C.; the surplus of the first charge being carried into the "Estimated Value of Security" column in list C., and there deducted from the amount of the second debt, the difference between the two amounts being carried into the last column on list C., which is headed "Balance of Debt Unsecured," to rank against the estate for dividend. When the value of any security twice charged is not enough to meet the first charge, of course both creditors will be entered on list C., as the fact of the second charge should be disclosed even although it has no value as a security.

When the value of any security is more than usually uncertain from any cause, a note should be added stating that the value figures are merely approximately estimated for the purposes of this account, and explaining the nature and cause of possible changes in the value of the security. Unless the value of the security is known to have depreciated since it was given, in the case of cash or goods advanced on such security these uncertain values may usually be estimated at the amount of the claim thereon, shewing a fully-secured creditor without any surplus.

Anyone who has supplied the debtor with furniture or machinery under a "hire-purchase agreement" should be entered on list B. as a fully-secured creditor. In exceptional cases, where the instalment payments are nearly completed and the articles of such a nature as would be realized at more than the creditor's claim, a surplus might be shewn. But this can only be done after careful consideration of each particular case and the exact terms of the hiring agreement. The same may be said of articles pawned. The pawnbroker is a fully-secured creditor, but rarely, except in recent transactions of special articles, can any surplus value be shewn. The amount under this item is usually very small, and the matter consequently is not important. In many cases, where there is little or no realisable value in pawn tickets, they may be entered under the head of "Other Property" on list C.

All the items, with proper dates and amounts and descriptions, having thus been entered on lists B. and C., add up the various money columns and set down the totals, preparatory to carrying the said totals to the front sheet. Any free surplus on list B. will constitute an asset of the estate, while any surplus on list B. which is the security of another creditor on list C. will be dealt with there, and thus reduce the total amount of liabilities ranking against the estate. When completed lists B. and C. will be something like the following:—

LIST "B."

CREDITORS FULLY SECURED.									
No.	Name of Creditor.	Address and Occupation.	Amount of debt.	Date when Contracted.	Year.	Consideration.	Particulars of Security.	Date when given.	Estimated Value of Security.
1	Bowen, W. C. ...	19, Seven Sisters-road, Grocer	300 0 0	April	1886	Money lent.	First mortgage on three freehold cottages at Green-lane, Tottenham	April, '86	600 0 0
2	Ferguson, D. ...	5, High-street, Islington, Solicitor	550 0 0	May	1884	Money lent, and interest.	First mortgage on leasehold property, 20, Queen-street, Dalston	May, '84	550 10 0
3	Hughes, Hy. ...	13, Falcon-square, Merchant	15 0 0	June	1886	Money lent	On five shares (fully paid) in The Great Wheel Bang Mining Co., present value uncertain. Shares not quoted on Change	June, '86	15 0 0
4	Robinson, J. ...	4, Kingsland-road, Pawnbroker	5 0 0	Dec. 3	1888	Money lent	On Engravings (framed), pledged	3 Dec, '88	9 0 0
									1,174 10 0
									304 0 0

Signature, JOHN BULL.

LIST "C."

CREDITORS PARTLY SECURED.									
No.	Name of Creditor.	Address and Occupation.	Amount of debt.	Date when Contracted.	Year.	Consideration.	Particulars of Security.	Month and Year when given.	Estimated Value of Security.
1	Denholm, E. ...	5, St. George's-square, Gentleman	80 0 0	Feb.	1887	Money lent.	Bill of sale on household furniture	Feb, '87	60 0 0
2	Greensfield, D.	40, Kingsland-road, Draper	410 0 0	Jan.	1887	Money lent, and interest due.	Second mortgage on freehold cottages at Green-lane, Tottenham	Jan, '87	300 0 0
									360 0 0
									130 0 0

Signature, JOHN BULL.

LIMITATION TO WIFE'S NEXT OF KIN.

IN *Clarke v. Hayne* (87 W. R. 667) KAY, J., dissented from the recent authorities, and reverted to the canon of construction adopted by LORD ROMILLY, in the earlier canon. The question relates to the common provision in settlements by which property is to go, upon the decease of husband and wife, to the persons who, under the Statutes of Distribution, would be entitled thereto if the wife had survived her husband and had then died possessed thereof and intestate. The exact words of the provision of course vary, but the point that always requires to be considered is, whether the next of kin are to be ascertained at the time of her actual death—assuming that she predeceases her husband—or upon the supposition that she died immediately after her husband—that is, at the time of his death. In *Pinder v. Pinder* (28 Beav. 44) the limitation was, in the event of the wife predeceasing the husband, to him for life and, after his death, "in trust for the person or persons who, under the statutes made for the distribution of the estates of intestates, would then be entitled to the personal estate of" the wife, "in case she had survived" the husband, "and had died possessed of the same intestate." LORD ROMILLY held that, while next of kin are *prima facie* to be determined on a person's death, yet if the instrument says that they are to be ascertained at any other time, the court must so construe the gift. Consequently, the only question was as to the grammatical meaning of the above words, and on this point, relying on the word *then*, with the subsequent hypothetical survival of the wife, he decided that the actual date to be taken was that of the husband's death, and that the wife's next of kin were to be ascertained as though she had died immediately after this. Shortly afterwards he dealt with the case of *Chalmers v. North* (28 Beav. 175) in the same way. There the trust was, in case the intended wife, Anna Maria Chalmers, predeceased her husband, then, subject to his life interest, in favour of "such person or persons as, at the decease of her, Anna Maria Chalmers, would, under the statutes for the distribution of intestate's effects, have been entitled to her personal estate, as her next of kin, in case she had survived her husband and had afterwards died intestate." In the case before KAY, J., he is reported to have said that the words here were the same as in *Pinder v. Pinder*, but clearly this is not so, and the differences are material. There is a distinct reference to the death of the wife, and by no means so obvious a postponement of the date of ascertainment till after the death of the husband. Indeed it now becomes possible to construe them as implying a hypothetical death of the husband in the lifetime of the wife. LORD ROMILLY felt the difficulty which the words "at the decease of her, Anna Maria Chalmers," created, but he got over it by treating them merely as an ordinary form of expression shewing that the next of kin were to be determined indeed upon the wife's death, but not interfering with any artificial date which might have been pointed out for this in substitution for the actual date. Accordingly, under the later words of the provision, he held that this artificial date was fixed, as before, immediately after the actual date of the death of the husband. In *Druitt v. Seaward* (34 W. R. 180, 31 Ch. D. 234), the question came before PEARSON, J., and he disagreed with the reasoning of LORD ROMILLY in *Chalmers v. North*. Here a testator by his will directed a daughter's share to be held ultimately, after the decease of herself and her husband, and upon failure of children at the decease of the survivor, in trust for the person or persons who, under the Statutes of Distribution, "would, on her decease, have been entitled thereto in case she having survived her husband and had then (*sic*) died possessed thereof and intestate." PEARSON, J., said that these words were different to those in *Chalmers v. North*, and so it was unnecessary to hold that that case was not rightly decided, but this was a mere evasion. The words themselves are indeed not the same, but the sense in each case seems to be identical. However, as he thus felt himself at liberty to regard the question as an open one, he proceeded to adopt the alternative view which we have mentioned above, taking as his ground the real object of the limitation, which was simply to exclude the husband. Emphasising, then, the words "on her decease," he took them as indicating the time at which the next of kin were to be ascertained, the subsequent words simply shewing that her husband was to be taken to have predeceased her—that is, the husband's death was made hypothetical, and not her own. Weight was also attached to the word "then" as shewing that the time of her actual death was contemplated. It is unnecessary to set out the same form as that in *Druitt v. Seaward*, as it was practically in the same form as that in *Druitt v. Seaward*. The case came before STIRLING, J., who accepted the *dictum* of LORD ROMILLY in *Chalmers v. North*, but gave it a different application. This, as stated above, was to the effect that the next of kin must be ascertained at the death of the wife, unless the time for creating an artificial class is clearly pointed out. LORD ROMILLY had thought, on the grammatical construction of the words before him, that this latter requirement was fulfilled; but STIRLING, J., took an opposite view. Following PEARSON, J., he pointed out that the real object was to exclude the husband, and that, provided this was done, there was no reason for creating an

artificial class. Accordingly, he held that the next of kin were to be ascertained at the death of the wife. KAY, J., has now, in *Clarke v. Hayne*, raised the curious point that the next of kin ascertained by excluding the husband are themselves an artificial class, and that, this being so, there is no *prima facie* reason for ascertaining them at the actual death of the wife rather than at any other time. The words of the limitation in that case were very similar to those in *Pinder v. Pinder* (*supra*), the ultimate trust of certain property, after the decease of the husband and wife, being "for the person or persons who, under the statutes made for the distribution of the estates of intestates, would then be entitled thereto in case" the wife, "having survived" the husband, "were to die possessed thereof and intestate." Upon these KAY, J., argued that, in the absence of the limitation, if the husband survived, he would take the wife's personal estate in his common law right, and not by virtue of the Statutes of Distribution. Consequently he could only be excluded, and the next of kin admitted, by creating an artificial class of persons who would really, under those statutes, have no right. This disposed of the presumption in favour of the persons entitled at the actual death of the wife upon which PEARSON and STIRLING, JJ., had acted, and once more left the ground clear for a strict grammatical interpretation of the words. Consequently KAY, J., went back to the construction of Lord ROMILLY, and found in them a clear indication that the actual date to be taken was the date of the husband's death, and that the wife's next of kin were to be ascertained at the time when this happened.

As to the absolute correctness of the result, it is hardly possible to express an opinion. The ostensible object in each case is to arrive at the intention of the testator, but it is probably safe to say that, on the particular point in question, this is non-existent. It is clear that there is always in these cases a general intention to exclude the husband, but, provided this is done, it matters little to the testator at what time the wife's next of kin are ascertained. In any case they are an indefinite class of persons, and he cannot be supposed to design his bounty for one set rather than another. Consequently it is not so important to attach a strictly accurate meaning to the words as to establish by uniform decisions a rule which may be safely relied upon for guidance. It is a pity, therefore, that PEARSON and STIRLING, JJ., abandoned the rule laid down by Lord ROMILLY, but as they had done so it is a pity again that KAY, J., has chosen, by means of a very refined distinction, to dissent from them. The result is that no interpretation of the clause in question can now be safely acted upon until the matter has been taken to the Court of Appeal.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Before the Vacation Judge.

Re WAINMAN, PEAKE v. WAINMAN—Pollock, B., 21st August.

TRUSTEES—REPAIRS—IMPROVEMENTS—BUILDINGS—TENANT FOR LIFE—REMAINDERMAN—INFANT—JURISDICTION.

In this case a question arose as to whether the court had jurisdiction to sanction the expenditure by trustees of money in repairing business premises and in building new buildings, and to authorise them to raise the money by mortgage or charge of the premises, the remainderman being an infant. An originating summons was taken out by the trustees of the will of Benjamin Wainman, asking that the following inquiries might be directed, and authorities given, in matters arising in the administration of the estate of the said testator:—(1) That an inquiry may be directed as to what repairs and improvements necessary to repair the trust premises comprised in the will of the above-mentioned Benjamin Wainman in such a state as to be tenantable or saleable have been made, and what sums have been expended in respect thereof; (2) that an inquiry may be directed as to what sums have been expended in the completion of buildings left unfinished by the testator; (3) that the trustees and executors of the said will may be at liberty to expend a sum not exceeding £1,000 in the erection of a new dye-house upon the said trust premises and such other buildings as may be necessary for the purpose of rendering the same tenantable or saleable; (4) that the said trustees and executors may be at liberty to raise by mortgage or charge of the said trust premises the sum of £1,000 in the last preceding paragraph referred to, together with such sums as may, in answer to the inquiries mentioned in the first and second paragraphs of this summons, be found to have been expended for the purposes therein described. At the testator's death the property, consisting principally of dyeing mills near Leeds, was in a very bad state of repair, and the trustees expended considerable sums in maintaining and improving the property. Upon the matter coming before Kekewich, J., in chambers, he directed counsel to be instructed to argue the question of jurisdiction on behalf of the infant remainderman. Counsel for the summons said that he had evidence that the repairs were necessary and beneficial to the estate, also the new dye-house would largely increase the value of the property. Counsel for the infant remainderman said that the court had no jurisdiction to sell or mortgage an infant's estate for the purpose of erecting new buildings thereon: *Calvert v. Godfrey* (6 Beav. 97); *Field v. Moore* (7 De G. M. & G. 691);

Frith v. Cameron (12 Eq. 169); *Conway v. Fenton* (40 Ch. D. 519); *Re Jackson* (21 Ch. D. 786); *Hibbert v. Cooke* (1 Sim. & St. 552); *Dent v. Dent* (30 Beav. 363). Counsel for the tenant for life supported the summons. Counsel for the trustees, in reply, cited *Vyse v. Foster* (8 Ch. App. 309).

POLLOCK, B., said that he should pause if he thought that Kekewich, J., in *Conway v. Fenton* intended to throw a doubt on the original jurisdiction of the court; but he thought that was not so. On the authorities he thought he had power under the original jurisdiction of the court, where the expenditure was asked for the benefit of the infant, to make the order.—COUNSEL, Robert Younger; G. W. Tullents; Macnamara. SOLICITORS, Cooper, Thorogood, & Tabor, for Bond, Barwick, & Peake, Leeds.

Re COROMANDEL GOLD CO. (LIM.)—Pollock, B., 28th August.

COMPANY—WINDING UP—CREDITOR—PETITION.

In this case a question arose as to whether a creditor was entitled to a winding-up order, or an order continuing the voluntary winding up of the company under the supervision of the court, on the ground that the voluntary liquidator was not an independent person capable of managing the affairs of the company for the benefit of all parties. A petition was presented by creditors asking for a compulsory order. After the presentation of the petition, at a meeting of shareholders, a resolution was passed, and subsequently confirmed, to wind up the company voluntarily, and Mr. W. J. Lavington, the secretary of the company, was appointed voluntary liquidator. It was said, on behalf of the petitioners, that it was proposed to raise additional capital and reconstruct the company; but it was submitted that the voluntary liquidator was not an independent person capable of managing the affairs of the company for the benefit of all parties. He was a promoter of the company, the holder of 1,460 fully paid-up shares; he was secretary, and would, as liquidator, in the case of a sale, be in the position both of vendor and purchaser. The petitioners were entitled either to a compulsory or a supervision order. The petition was right when presented, and nothing had occurred since to make it wrong: *Re West Surrey Tanning Co.*, 2 Eq. 737; *Re Littlehampton Steamship Co.*, 34 Beav. 256; *Re Gold Co.*, 11 Ch. D. 709; *New Sombro Phosphate Sewage Co. v. Erlanger*, 5 Ch. D. 73.

POLLOCK, B., said that if he saw anything improper being done in the voluntary winding up he might interfere, but he did not see anything of the kind. He should therefore dismiss the petition, with costs.—COUNSEL, Marten, Q.C., and Ashton Cross; Vennell; Seward Brice, Q.C., and Bramwell Davis; Miller, Q.C., and Lavington; Manson. SOLICITORS, Jerome, Trevor, & Co.; Ernest Wallis; Snell, Son, & Greenip.

Re WEST INDIAN GOLD MINING CORPORATION (LIM.)—Pollock, B., 28th August.

COMPANY—DEBENTURE-HOLDER—WINDING UP—ASSETS.

In this case a question arose as to the right of a debenture-holder to a compulsory order, where other debenture-holders and creditors opposed, and there were no assets of the company except mining land in San Domingo. A petition was presented by a debenture-holder asking for a compulsory order. On the 20th of July, 1889, the coupons for January were delivered to the company but were not paid. It was contended on behalf of the petitioners that they were not bound to do more than shew a *prima facie* case: *Re Olathe Silver Mining Co.* (27 Ch. D. 278). Counsel for debenture-holders and shareholders opposing the petition relied on *Re Chapel House Colliery Co.* (24 Ch. D. 259).

POLLOCK, B., said that he had no doubt that the debenture-holder in July had not been paid. But would a winding-up order put him in a better position? Here the company was in San Domingo, and there were a large number of debenture-holders who opposed the petition. The property in San Domingo was undistributable, and the case came within the decision of Cotton, L.J., in the case of *Re Chapel House Colliery Co.* It was said that there were some assets in this country, but it was stated in an affidavit on behalf of the company that the sole property of the company consisted of mining land in San Domingo, and there were no other assets. Further, there were numerous other creditors to the amount of £3,500. He should, therefore, dismiss the petition, with costs.—COUNSEL, Marten, Q.C., and Willis Bund; Seward Brice, Q.C., and D. L. Alexander; Metcalfe. SOLICITORS, Paddison, Son, & Fullilove; Michael Abrahams, Sons, & Co.; W. F. Tarn.

BEAUMONT v. PROVIDENT ASSURANCE CO. (LIM.)—Pollock, B., 28th August.

TRADE NAME—COLOURABLE IMITATION—INJUNCTION.

In this case a question arose as to the infringement of the plaintiffs' trade name of the Provident Life Office by the defendant company. This was a motion on behalf of the plaintiffs to restrain the defendants from commencing business under a name so similar to the name of the plaintiffs as to be calculated to deceive. The plaintiff company was formed in 1807, their business being life insurance, and their capital was £2,000,000. The defendant company was formed in July, 1889, as a benefit building society, with capital of £25,000, and it was now proposed to add life insurance business. Counsel for the plaintiff referred to *Hendriks v. Montagu* (17 Ch. D. 638), *Guardian Fire and Life Assurance Co. v. Guardian and General Insurance Co.* (50 L. J. Ch. 253), *Accident Insurance Co. v. Accident, Disease, and General Insurance Corporation* (54 L. J. Ch. 104). Counsel for the defendants contended that there was no similarity in the names.

POLLOCK, B., said that the question was not one which could be decided by the Vacation Court. The motion, with the consent of all parties, then stood over to the trial, but with liberty to the plaintiff to bring it on at

any time in case the defendants commenced any ordinary insurance business before the trial.—COUNSEL, *Marten, Q.C., and Bryan Farrer; Willis, Q.C., and H. T. Eve.* SOLICITORS, *Burrows, Barnes, & Pears; Hatchett-Jones & Co.*

MOORE v. MALYON—Pollock, B., 28th August.

MORTGAGEE—PRINCIPAL OVERDUE—MORTGAGOR IN POSSESSION—RECEIVER.

In this case a question arose as to the right of a mortgagee to the appointment of a receiver. The second mortgagee of a public-house asked for the appointment of a receiver and manager. The principal was four years overdue, and there had been a demand made for payment. The mortgagor was in possession. Counsel for the plaintiff referred to *Mason v. Westoby* (32 Ch. D. 206). Counsel for the defendant referred to *Plaskett v. Lord Dillon* (1 Hogan Ir. Rep. 201).

POLLOCK, B., said that he had had the opportunity of considering the authorities, and had come to the conclusion that the plaintiff was entitled to have a receiver appointed. He should not appoint a manager. There was one case very much in point—*Mason v. Westoby*, in which Bacon, V.C., looked upon it as a right. The Judicature Act, 1873, gave a discretion, but the discretion must be exercised in accordance with the settled practice. The order must go, striking out all the last part of the motion as to the manager. There would be a reference to chambers to appoint a receiver and to fix an occupation rent, the mortgagor to abstain as from the service of the notice of motion.—COUNSEL, *A. à Beckett Ferrell; Keary.* SOLICITORS, *Atkinson & Dresser; Wedlake, Lettis, & Wedlake.*

WEYMAN v. MASON—Pollock, B., 28th August.

VACATION BUSINESS—PARTNERSHIP—RESTRICTIVE COVENANT—INJUNCTION.

In this case a question arose as to whether the case was one proper to be decided by the Vacation Judge. The motion was on behalf of the plaintiff, Mr. James Edwardes Weyman, to restrain the defendant, Mr. Richard Mason, his travellers, and other servants, agents, and workmen, from transacting or carrying on the business of an agricultural engineer, iron and brass founder, or art ironworker, in violation of the covenant on that behalf contained in an indenture dated the 10th of March, 1885. The plaintiff and defendant had been in partnership, but the partnership was dissolved in 1885, the defendant covenanting not to carry on such business for so many years within a certain radius. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had frequently broken the covenant.

POLLOCK, B., said that there was a conflict of evidence, and he could not decide the question on motion; the motion must stand to the trial.—COUNSEL, *Marten, Q.C., and Lawrence Hadley.* SOLICITORS, *C. E. Bird; W. R. Francis.*

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

THE LONDON UNIVERSITY LAW EXAMINATIONS.

HANDBOOK TO THE INTERMEDIATE AND FINAL LL.B. OF LONDON UNIVERSITY. By a B.A., LL.B. (Lond.). SECOND EDITION. Stevens & Haynes.

This useful little guide has now reached a second edition, and has been improved by additional chapters relative to the second or final LL.B. examination. The hints on what books should be read, the test questions on Maine's Ancient Law, and collection of Latin maxims are sure to be acceptable to its readers. An analysis of the whole of Austin, occupying fifty pages, is, however, rather out of place in a guide; an analysis of two or three chapters, as an example of what the student should do, would be enough, for ready-made analyses are not much use as aids to the memory.

STUDENTS' STATUTES FOR THE YEAR 1889.

THE CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE ACT (52 & 53 VICT. c. 7).

Section 5.—In addition to the present stamp duties a new duty, termed an estate duty of one per cent., is imposed on personal property passing by will or intestacy exceeding £10,000.

Section 6.—In addition to the duties imposed by the Succession Duty Act, 1853, and section 21 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1888, whenever the value of a succession to real property exceeds £10,000, or whenever the value of a succession under a will or intestacy of any person dying on or after June 1st, 1889, is less than £10,000, but such value together with the value of any other benefit taken by the successor under such will or intestacy exceeds £10,000, an extra duty of one per cent. is made payable.

[This does not include leaseholds in respect of which duty has been paid under section 5.]

Section 8.—For non-delivery of the requisite statement in respect of the foregoing a penalty of double duty is incurred, or in the alternative the commissioners may recover the arrears of duty and interest thereon at four per cent.

Section 11 amends section 38 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act of 1881, and fixes with duty gifts not made *bond fide* twelve months before death of the deceased, including property taken under a gift whenever made of which property *bond fide* possession and enjoyment shall not have been assumed by the donee immediately upon the gift.

Section 12.—Purchasers and mortgagees not to be liable for succession or estate duty after six years from the date of notice of the succession to the commissioners, or from the date of the first payment by such successor of any instalment when it is paid by eight equal half-yearly instalments as under the Act of 1853, or after two years from the time for the payment of the last instalment if the successor has availed himself of the option given by section 22 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1888, or, in the absence of any such notice or payment, after the expiration of twelve years of the claim having arisen (or if such period of twelve years expires within six years from the date of the Act then after the expiration of six years from the Act) the successor or accountable person is to remain liable.

Section 14.—Legacy and succession duty to be statute barred after six years from the date of settling the duty accounts if the account was a full and true one.

Section 18.—Every contract for the sale or purchase of property, save such as passes by delivery or must be conveyed by deed, to be stamped as a conveyance, but the stamp duty to be returnable if within twelve months the executory contract is rescinded or becomes null and void. Any subsequent instrument for vesting the property contracted to be sold to be stamped with a 10s. stamp.

COMMISSIONERS FOR OATHS ACT, 1889.

Section 1 authorizes the Lord Chancellor to appoint practising solicitors, or other fit and proper persons, to be commissioners for oaths, and to revoke any such appointment.

Section 5.—The jurat of any affidavit to state where and when the oath was taken.

Section 7.—Wilful and corrupt false swearing amounts to perjury.

SALE OF HORSEFLESH, &c., REGULATION ACT.

Section 1.—Horseflesh not to be sold, &c., for human food unless words indicating that horseflesh is sold there are legibly posted.

Section 2.—Horseflesh not to be sold as other meat.

Section 6.—Penalty of £20 for every offence against the Act, recoverable in a summary manner.

NEW ORDERS, &c.

ORDER OF COURT.

Thursday, the 22nd day of August, 1889.

WHEREAS, from the present state of the business before Mr. Justice North, Mr. Justice Stirling, and Mr. Justice Kekewich respectively, it is expedient that a portion of the causes assigned to Mr. Justice North and Mr. Justice Stirling should, for the purpose only of hearing or of trial, be transferred to Mr. Justice Kekewich; Now I, the Right Honourable Hardinge Stanley, Baron Halsbury, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, do hereby order that the several causes and matters set forth in the schedules hereto be accordingly transferred from the said Mr. Justice North and Mr. Justice Stirling to Mr. Justice Kekewich, for the purpose only of hearing or of trial, and be marked in the cause books accordingly. And this order is to be drawn up by the registrar, and set up in the several offices of the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice.

FIRST SCHEDULE.

From Mr. Justice NORTH.

1889.

Watt v Maxim Electric Co. ld 1888 W 3,039 April 9
Maxim Electric Co. ld v Watt 1888 M 3,526 April 1
Atkin v Smith 1888 A 1,357 April 18
In re Hooper's Settlement Hooper v Chambers, &c 1888 H 3,463 April 26
Kershaw v Lister 1889 K 74 May 6
Bates v Gibbs 1889 B 1,313 May 6
In re Patrick Bills v Tatham 1888 P 2,466 May 11
Moore v Turner 1889 M 629 May 14
Farrow v Third Gen Post Office, &c., Buildg Socy 1888 F 1,261 May 15
Phillips v The Ivel Cycle Co. ld 1889 P 186a May 18
Dick v Hannay 1888 D 1,751 May 20
Cooper v Rooke 1889 C 863 May 20
Morley v Yorkshire Lead Mines, ld 1888 M 2,618 May 20
Hustler v Hammond 1888 H 2,401 May 21
Robinson v Adams 1889 R 800 May 21
Crafts v Crafts 1888 C 3,741 May 22
Rugby Charity Trustees v George 1888 R 2,267 May 23
House Property, &c, Co, ld v Projectile Co, ld 1889 H 494 May 23
Oxford v Cocks 1889 O 343 May 28
Shafte v Lon & Prov Law Assoc Socy & ors 1882 S 1,150 May 31
Roseliter v Roseliter 1889 R 434 May 31
Sheppard v Lon Electric Supply Corp'n, ld 1889 S 593 June 3
Whitby v Hoskins 1889 W 2,295 June 5
Palmer v Clark 1889 P 353 June 7
Bonsall v Davies 1889 B 866 June 7
Davison v Johnson 1887 D 2,248 June 8
Lon & N W Ry Co v Boulton 1889 L 994 June 13
Simmons v Lon Joint Stock Bank, ld 1888 S 2,458 June 14
Coutts & Co v Irish Exhibition in London 1888 C 4,552 June 19
Bolton v Ridley 1889 B 1,039 June 20

SECOND SCHEDULE.
From Mr. Justice STIRLING.
1888.

Strousberg v McGregor	1887	S	2,545	April 24
Follows v Wilcock	1887	F	614	May 18
				1889.
Rees v Richmond	1888	R	1,650	Jan 11
Heath v Duke of Abercorn	1888	H	2,879	Jan 23
Hall v Powell	1888	H	1,992	March 15
Ward v James	1888	W	4,154	March 22
Cook v Levene	1889	C	675	April 5
Countess of Ellesmere v Davis	1888	E	1,413	April 6
Hopcroft v Hopcroft	1888	H	324	April 8
Hatfield v Nunn	1888	H	2,247	April 15
Smith v Church	1888	S	3,012	April 17
Edney v Moedell	1888	E	1,079	April 18
Browne v Margrave	1889	B	1,002	April 25
In re Longstaff	Longstaff v Longstaff			third party notice 1888 L 2,710 May 2
Schultz v Vaaser	1888	S	1,821	May 2
Oliver v Hunting	1889	O	162	May 7
Duncan v Dixon	1888	D	1,995	May 11
Wallis v Lomas	1888	W	2,209	May 15
Hemmings v Isaacson	1888	H	2,303	May 16
In re Warren	Randleston v Randleston	1888	R	1,214 May 21
In re The New Durham Salt Co, ld, & Co's Acts (mtn)				May 24
Ritson v Hendon Paper Works Co, ld	1889	R	322	May 31
Gale v Franklin	1889	G	8	June 4
In re Walker	Walker v Walker	1889	W	833 June 4
McDougall v Copestake	1888	M	2,034	June 13
Reed v Swann	1889	R	41	June 13
Yeoman, on behalf, &c, v Agricultural Auction, &c, ld	1888	Y	1,008	June 13
Vallance v Burr & Co	1888	V	850	June 13
Aplin v Lon Joint Stock Bank, ld	1888	A	894	June 14
Little v Lon Joint Stock Bank, ld	1888	L	1,495	June 14
Cockle v Sadgrove	1889	C	267	June 17
Aldridge v Aldridge	Aldridge v Aldridge	1888	A	1,112 June 17
Shakell v Helyer (adj sumns)	1889	S	669	June 20
Rubinstein v Foppoli	1889	R	697	June 20
Morris & ors v Quibell	M	775	June 26	
In re F Hearn	In re M E Hearn	Rynd v Lang	1889	H 1,401 June 27
Gard v Barry Patent Manure Co, ld	1889	G	720	June 29
Universal, &c, Machine Co, ld v Braun	1888	N	1,009	June 29
Bone v Smith	1888	B	886	July 1
In re Black	Willems v Barr	1889	B	724 July 2
Williams v Snyder Dynamite Projectiles Co, ld	1889	W	817	July 4
Dacres Patterson v Foote	1889	D	106	July 8
Eddowes v Argentine Loan & Mercantile Agency Co, ld	1888	E	195	July 8
Vorwerk & Son v Evans & Co	1888	V	876	July 9
In re Laurence	Newman v Laurence	1889	L	532 July 12
Hanson v Dodd	1889	H	1,266	July 13
Sturridge v Illiffe	1889	S	1,737	July 16
Webb v Prime	1889	W	449	July 19
Scott v Snyder Dynamite Projectile Co, ld	1889	S	2,113	July 19
Grady v Grady	1889	G	1,484	Aug 14

HALSBURY, C.

The following is a list of the transferred actions arranged in the order in which they will come into the paper:—

Strousberg v McGregor	Morley v Yorkshire Lead Mines, ld
Follows v Wilcock	Huestler v Hammond
Rees v Richmond	Robinson v Adams
Heath v Duke of Abercorn	Re Warren, Randleston v Randleston
Hall v Powell, Powell v Hall	Crafts v Crafts
Ward v James	Rugby Charity Trustees v George
Cook v Levene	House Property, &c, Co v Projectile
Countess of Ellesmere v Davis	Co, ld
Hopcraft v Hopcraft	Re New Durham Salt Co, ld & Com-
Watt v Maxim, &c, Co, Maxim, &c,	panies Acts
Co, v Watt	Oxford v Cocks
Hatfield v Nunn	Shafto v Lon & Prov Law Assoc Soc
Smith v Church	Rossiter v Rossiter
Atkin v Smith	Ritson v Hendon Paper Works, ld
Edney v Moedell	Sheppard v London Electric Supply
Browne v Margrave	Corporation, ld
Re Hooper, Hooper v Chambers	Gale v Franklin
Re Longstaff, Longstaff v Longstaff	Re Walker, Walker v Walker
Schultz v Vaaser	Whitby v Hoskins
Kershaw v Lister	Palmer v Clark
Bates v Gibbs	Bonsall v Davies
Oliver v Hunting	Davison v Johnson
Re Patrick, Bills v Tatham	London & North Western Ry Co v
Duncan v Dixon	Boulton
Moore v Turner	McDougall v Copestake
Farrow v 3rd General Post Office, &c, Building Society	Reed v Swann
Wallis v Lomas	Yeoman v Agricultural, &c, Co
Hemmings v Isaacson	Vallance v Burr & Co
Phillips v Ivel Cycle Co, ld.	Simmons v London Joint - Stock
Dick v Hannay	Bank, ld
Cooper v Rooke	Aplin v Same
	Little v Same

Cockle v Sadgrove	Bone v Smith
Aldridge v Aldridge, Oakley v Al-	Re Black, Willems v Barr
dridge	Williams v Snyder Dynamite, &c, Co
Coutts & Co v Irish Exhibition in	Dacres-Patterson v Foote
London	Eddowes v Argentine Loan, &c, So-
Bolton v Ridley	ciet, ld
Shakell v Helyer	Vorwerk & Son v Evans & Co
Rubinstein v Foppoli	Re Laurence, Newman v Laurence
Morris v Quibell	Hanson v Dodd
Re Hearn, Rynd v Lang	Sturridge v Illiffe
Gard v Barry's Patent Manure Co, ld	Webb v Prince
Universal Automatic Machine Co, ld	Scott v Snyder Dynamite, &c, Co
v Braun	Grady v Grady

LEGAL NEWS.

OBITUARY.

Mr. JOHN DUNNINGTON FLETCHER, deputy-assistant judge of the London Sessions, died at his residence, 12, Westbourne-terrace, on the 3rd inst., in his seventieth year. Mr. Fletcher was the eldest son of Mr. John Fletcher, of Liverpool, and was born in 1820. He was educated at Christ College, Cambridge, where he graduated in the third class of the Classical Tripos, and also as a junior optime in 1840. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Easter Term, 1845, and he formerly practised on the Northern Circuit. He was for many years a revising barrister and assistant recorder of Liverpool. In 1879, on the death of Mr. Serjeant Cox, he was appointed deputy-assistant judge of the Middlesex Sessions, and since the passing of the Local Government Act he had filled the same post at the London Sessions. Mr. Fletcher was married in 1851 to the daughter of Mr. Charles Tee. At the County of London Sessions on the 12th inst. Sir Peter Edlin said:—"I desire to say a few words respecting the great loss we have sustained by the loss of Mr. Fletcher. He had presided in the second court of these sessions continuously for several years, and always with advantage to the public. Naturally mild, humane, and charitable, he was a most patient, considerate, and painstaking judge, and the long experience he had had in criminal trials, his habit of close and careful observation, and his sobriety of judgment, inspired a well-merited confidence in the justice of his decisions. He was one of the most lovable men I have ever known, and, lamenting his death as we all do, I feel sure that the bar would desire to join with me in giving expression to the sincere respect and esteem in which we held him." Mr. Besley, representing the bar, concurred in Sir P. Edlin's observations.

Mr. EDMUND HENRY COLEMAN, solicitor (of the firm of Sangster & Coleman), of Pontefract, died on the 8th inst. Mr. Coleman was the son of Mr. Henry John Coleman, solicitor, of Pontefract, and was born in 1851. He was admitted a solicitor in 1876, and he had since practised at Pontefract, being in partnership with Mr. John William Sangster, who is registrar of the Pontefract County Court. Mr. Coleman was town clerk and clerk of the peace for the borough of Pontefract, and clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes. He was buried at the Pontefract Cemetery on the 12th inst. He was unmarried.

Mr. CHARLES SYKES SUNDERLAND, solicitor (of the firm of Craven & Sunderland), of Huddersfield and Brighouse, died at Brighouse on the 5th inst. Mr. Sunderland was the youngest son of Mr. Henry Sunderland, and was born in 1843. He was articled to Messrs. Chambers & Chambers, of Brighouse, and he was admitted a solicitor in 1865, when he became a clerk in the office of Mr. Jonas Craven, of Huddersfield and Brighouse, whom he afterwards joined in partnership. He was a perpetual commissioner for the West Riding of Yorkshire, and he had been clerk to the Southowram School Board ever since its formation. Mr. Sunderland was buried on the 9th inst.

Mr. MARK SHEPARD, solicitor, of 27, College-street, College Hill, died at his residence at Streatham on the 17th inst., after a long illness, at the age of seventy-two. Mr. Shepard was born in 1817. He was admitted a solicitor in 1840, and he formerly practised in Clifford's-inn in partnership with Mr. Richard Kingdon. He was one of the attorneys of the Palace Court. From Clifford's-inn he removed to Sise-lane, and thence to College-street. He had been for some time associated in partnership with his son, Mr. Herbert Shepard, who was admitted a solicitor in 1870. In 1867 he was elected a common councilman for the Ward of Cheap. Four years afterwards Alderman Sir Thomas Gabriel appointed him deputy for the ward, and he filled that post till his death. Mr. Shepard was an active member of the Common Council, and he had been chairman of several important committees. He was buried at Norwood Cemetery on the 21st inst.

Mr. JAMES DUNDAS DOWN, solicitor (of the firm of Down, Scott, & Down), of Dorking, died on the 19th inst., at the age of seventy. Mr. Down was the son of Dr. John Sommers Down, of Southampton, and was born in 1819. He was admitted a solicitor in 1842. He was for a short time engaged in the office of Messrs. Freshfield & Sons, of Bank-buildings. He next practised for a short time at Southampton, and about forty years ago he removed to Dorking, where he was formerly in partnership with Mr. Mark Smallpeice, now of Guildford. More recently he was associated with his nephew, Mr. Thomas Augustus Sommers Scott, and with his son, Mr. William John Down, who has just been appointed clerk to the county magistrates at Dorking, and he had also an office at Leatherhead. Mr. Down was a perpetual commissioner for the county

of Surrey, and he held several local appointments. He was clerk to the Dorking Highway Board and the Dorking Burial Board, and secretary and solicitor to the Dorking Gas Co. Mr. Down was married to the daughter of Mr. William Chaldecott, of Dorking, and he leaves three sons and two daughters. He was buried at the Dorking Cemetery on the 23rd inst.

Mr. JOHN WILLIAM ATKINSON, solicitor, of Leeds, died on the 25th inst., in his sixty-fifth year. Mr. Atkinson was the son of Mr. John Atkinson, solicitor, of Leeds, and was born in 1825. He served his articles with his father, and he was admitted about the year 1848. He was for many years a member of the firm of Dibb, Atkinson, & Braithwaite, of Leeds. He succeeded his father as clerk to the lieutenancy for the West Riding of Yorkshire, and he held that office for thirty-four years. He retired from practice about two years ago. Mr. Atkinson was married to the daughter of Mr. John Heaton, of Leeds, and he leaves two sons and four daughters. His son, Mr. John Cecil Atkinson, was admitted a solicitor in 1881, and is now a member of the firm of Dibb, Atkinson, & Braithwaite.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. JOHN TATHAM MORTON, solicitor, of Halifax, has been appointed Clerk to the Southwam Local Board. Mr. Morton was admitted a solicitor in 1888.

Mr. WILLIAM JOHN DOWN, solicitor (of the firm of Down, Scott, & Down), of Dorking and Leatherhead, has been appointed Clerk to the county magistrates at Dorking, in succession to the late Mr. John Hart. Mr. Down is the son of the late Mr. James Dundas Down, solicitor. He was admitted in 1884.

Mr. EDWARD BRUCE HINDLE, barrister, has been appointed Queen's Advocate for the Gold Coast Colony, in succession to Mr. Joseph Turner Hutchinson, who has been appointed Chief Justice of the Colony. Mr. Hindle was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in June, 1879. He formerly practised on the Northern Circuit, and he was for some time a district commissioner for the Gold Coast Colony.

Mr. FRANCIS STANBURY DAYMAN, solicitor (of the firm of Hole, Dayman, & Fisher), of Tiverton and Collympton, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. WILLIAM BENNETT, solicitor, of Bruton and Wincanton, has been appointed Registrar of the Wincanton County Court (Circuit No. 55) to act jointly with Mr. John Messiter. Mr. Bennett is clerk to the county magistrates at Wincanton. He was admitted a solicitor in 1868.

Mr. JOHN PETER BLIGHT, solicitor, of Callington, has been appointed Steward of the Manor of Calstock. Mr. Blight was admitted a solicitor in 1879.

Mr. JOHN ROBERT LENG, solicitor, of Bishop Auckland, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. THOMAS BISHOP CULL, solicitor (of the firm of Thacker & Cull), of Chedale, has been appointed Deputy-Coroner for the Uxotester Division of Staffordshire. Mr. Cull was admitted a solicitor in 1876.

Mr. CHARLES REGINALD GRYLLS (of the firm of Cowland & Grylls), of Launceston, has been appointed Registrar of the Launceston County Court (Circuit No. 59), in succession to the late Mr. George Graham White. Mr. Grylls has also been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature. Mr. Grylls was admitted a solicitor in 1882.

Mr. JAMES HENRY SPRING BRANSON, barrister, has been appointed Advocate-General for the Presidency of Madras. Mr. Branson was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Trinity Term, 1862.

GENERAL.

According to *Kemp's Mercantile Gazette* the number of failures in England and Wales gazetted during the week ending August 24 was 101. The number in the corresponding week of last year was 97, shewing an increase of 4, being a net decrease in 1889 to date of 128.

The Royal Assent was given by Commission on the 26th inst. to the following, among other Bills:—The Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill, Merchant Shipping Tonnage Bill, the Prevention of Cruelty to and Protection of Children Bill, the Factors Bill, the Revenue Bill, the Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill, the Palatine Court of Durham Bill, and the Official Secrets Bill.

A movement has been set on foot in the county of Dorset to protest against the employment of solicitors and trustees foreign to the district in bankruptcy cases. It is contended that at the present time the legal charges in bankruptcy cases are unnecessarily increased by railway and other charges incurred in bringing solicitors from Salisbury and other towns to conduct local cases. An influential meeting of solicitors and other persons was held at Dorchester on Saturday to discuss the grievance. The meeting was private, but it is stated that Mr. Trevor-Davies occupied the chair, and that Col. Hambro, M.P., was also present. The matter was fully discussed, and it was ultimately decided to ask the members of Parliament for the county to move for a return of the costs in all bankruptcy cases in the county.

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, AUG. 25.
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ABERDAIR TIN PLATE CO. LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Aug 21, directed to be heard before North, J., on Oct 25 Jones & Linnett, Quality ct, agents for Thomas, Swanson, solicitor for petitioners.
A OAKES & CO. LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 1, to send their names and addresses to Frederick S Salaman, 68, Chancery lane.
BULL HOTEL CO. LIMITED.—The Vacation Judge has, by an order dated Aug 14, appointed William Croeland, Leeds, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Oct 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Friday, Oct 25, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.
LUTHER HANSON & CO. LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to James Duff, Barrow House, Halifax. Tuesday, Nov 5, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.
MUSWELL HILL ESTATE CO. LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 7, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles James Hayter, 1, Drapers' gdn Markby & Co, Coleman st, solicitors for liquidator.
PEITCHARD & CO. LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Aug 19, directed to be heard before Pollock, B., on Wednesday, Sept 4. Reed & Reed, Basinghall st, agents for Boulting, Bridgewater, solicitor for petitioners.
WEST CUMBERLAND IRON AND STEEL CO. LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept 30, to send their names and addresses to Alfred Ebenezer Wenham, 114, Colmore row, Birmingham. Wragge & Co, Birmingham, solicitors for liquidator.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

DOWLAIS FIREMEN'S SOCIETY, Royal Exchange Inn, Dowlaish, Glamorgan Aug 18

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, AUG. 27.
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BISHOP & BUTT, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 5, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr Frank Newton Tribe, Albion chambers, Bristol. Abbot & Co, Bristol, solicitors for liquidator.
CHRYVEN MOOR UNITED LEAD CO. LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Edward Ashmond, 2, Drapers' gdn Monday, Oct 25, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.
COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.
EBENEZER LOAN CO. LIMITED.—By an order made by the Vice-Chancellor, dated Aug 12, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Earle & Co, Manchester, solicitors for petitioner.
EBENEZER LOAN CO. LIMITED.—The Vice-Chancellor has fixed Friday, Sept 3, at 11, at Duchy chambers, Clarence st, Manchester, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

CREDITORS' NOTICES. UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, AUG. 16.
LANDELLS, JAMES ARTHUR, Fern avenue, Newcastle upon Tyne, Provision Merchant. Oct 1. Bell v. Landells, Chitty, J. Forster, Newcastle upon Tyne.
RICHE, GEORGE LEOPOLD, Pelham rd, Wimbledon, Gent. Sept 23. Riche v. Riche, Chitty, J. Britton, Lincoln's inn fields.
TANCRED, ULRICH WILLIAM, Duke st, Manchester sq, Esq. Oct 1. Mount Shamrock Gold Co, Limited v. Tancred, Chitty, J. Lucas, Fenchurch st.
London Gazette.—TUESDAY, AUG. 20.
GEROTHWOHL, BENEDICT SIGISMUND, Queen's Gate. Oct 12. Hutchinson & Co. v. Chaplin. Irvine & Co, Hart st, Mark lane.
London Gazette.—FRIDAY, AUG. 23.
READ, RICHARD PENROSE, Epworth, Lincoln, Draper. Oct 22. Maw v. Read, Stirling, J. Lammie, Buckingham st, Adelphi.
London Gazette.—TUESDAY, AUG. 27.
GEROTHWOHL, BENEDICT SIGISMUND, Queen's Gate, Esq. Oct 12. Hutchinson & Co v Chaplin. Irvine & Co, Hart st, Mark lane.

UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, AUG. 16.
ALLEN, JOHN, Lower rd, Rotherhithe, Gent. Sept 25. Hawks & Co, Borough High st, Southwark.
BALL, ALFRED, Little Sutton, Cheshire, Licensed Victualler. Sept 9. Thompson & Hughes, Birkenhead.
BELL, CHARLOTTE, Southwick by Sea, Sussex. Sept 26. Emmet & Co, Bloomsbury sq.
BENSON, JOHN, Burley in Wharfedale, Yorks, Gent. Oct 10. Malcolm, Leeds.
BUOT, MICHAEL JOHN, Hull, Fruiterer. Oct 23. Frost & Dawson, Hull.
CHALKLEN, LYDIA, West Malling, Kent. Sept 20. Ellis, Maidstone.
DANDRIDGE, JOHN, Oxford rd, Ealing, Livery Stable Keeper. Sept 20. Child & Norton, Sloane st.
DAVID, JOHN, Cardiff, Draper. Sept 9. Sturt, Ironmonger lane.
DAVIS, JAMES, Clapton, Somerset, Farmer. Sept 30. Glyde, Bristol.
DEACON, RACHEL ANN, Spa rd, Bermondsey. Oct 15. Saxton & Son, Queen Victoria st.
DUNKAGE, HERBERT ALIBURY, Surbiton, Surrey, Esq. Sept 20. Mander & Watson, New sq, Lincoln's inn.
ELLIS, CHARLES, Maidstone, Gent. Sept 26. Stenning, Maidstone.
GRIGGS, JOHN, Stow Bardolph, Norfolk, Yeoman. Oct 1. Nunn, Downham Market.
HAMMOND, THEODORE EDWARD, Leighton rd, Kentish Town. Oct 13. May, Golden sq, St James.
HARRISON, WOODSWORTH, Ulverston, Esq. Sept 21. Dowson & Co, Bedford row.
HOCKLEY, WILLIAM, Bright terr, Forest gate, Essex, Retired Tug Owner. Sept 20. Vant, jun, Leadenhall st.
HOBBS, THOMAS, Billiter sq, Auctioneer. Sept 30. Druces & Attles, Billiter sq.
HUGHES, HORATIO NELSON, Liverpool, Commission Merchant. Sept 20. Laces & Co, Liverpool.
HURST, CHARLOTTE, Mortimer Cottage, Highgate. Sept 16. Day & Son, Great George st.
JACKSON, ESTHER, Ryarash, West Malling, Kent. Sept 30. Burgoyne & Co, Wood st, Cheapside.
JONES, JOHN, Aston, Warwick, Builder. Sept 1. Mitchell & Willmot, Birmingham, and Beauchamp, Worcester.

KANNREUTHER, JOSEPH, Birmingham, Merchant. Sept 29. Smith & Co, Birmingham.
 KINGDOM, JOHN, the Parade, Crickwood. Oct 1. Ray & Miers, Gt Portland st, Portland pl.
 LEACH, GEORGE, Boxmoor, Herts, Farmer. Oct 1. Sedgwick & Co, Watford.
 LIGHTWOOD, JULIANA, Aston juxta Birmingham. Sept 13. Brown & Co, Birmingham.
 MACKENZIE, JAMES CHRISTIE, Mark lane. Sept 29. Smith & Co, Birmingham.
 MILLNE, FRANCIS, Poole, Dorset, Esq. Sept 28. Trevanion & Co, Poole.
 PARSONS, ELIZABETH MARY, Warminster, Wilts. Oct 24. Chesterman, Bath.
 PRICE, WILLIAM BENJAMIN, Pembroke Dock, Wine Merchant. Sept 29. Jones-Lloyd, Pembroke Dock.
 ROB, MARY JANE, Catton Hall, nr Thirsk, Yorks. Sept 28. Richardson, Thirsk.
 ROWE, SUSAN, Fortess rd, Kentish Town. Sept 24. Pearce & Sons, Glitspur st.
 SPENCE, GEORGE, Cannon st. Sept 10. Abbott, Queen Victoria st.
 TIFFIN, JOHN, Layer Breton, Essex, Farmer. Sept 20. Pope & Co, Colchester.
 WALLIS, EMMA BEAUFOY, Milverton, Wawick. Sept 29. Field & Sons Leamington.
 WARING, JOSEPH, Axton juxta Birmingham, Beer Retailer. Sept 29. Smith & Co, Birmingham.
 WASS, EMMA, Morley, Yorks. Oct 16. Scatterd & Hopkins, Leeds, Morley.
 WASS, WILLIAM, Morley, Yorks, Joiner. Oct 16. Scatterd & Hopkins, Leeds, Morley.
 WRIGHT, EDWIN, Gravely Hill, nr Birmingham, Gent. Sept 29. Smith & Co, Birmingham.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Aug. 20.

ANDREWS, ANN, Cheddington, Bucks, Provision Dealer. Sept 20. Horwood & James, Aylesbury.
 BATH, CHARLES, Swansea. Oct 1. Johnson & Co, Austin Friars.
 BIRKIN, JOHN DEXTER, Bethnal Green rd, Licensed Victualler. Sept 30. Nantton & Son, Chesham.
 BRIGGS, DEBORAH ANNE, Montpellier crescent, Brighton. Sept 30. Upperton & Bacon, Brighton.
 BULL, HANNAH, Birmingham. Sept 7. Burton, Birmingham.
 ELWALL, SARAH, Ockenden rd, Islington. Oct 1. Croft & Shirley Turner, Coleman st.
 HOYSE, THOMAS, Sheffield, Grocer. Sept 22. Taylor, Sheffield.
 IZABY, GEORGE JOHN, Strood, Kent, Draper. Sept 17. Robinson, Strood.
 JONES, EDWARD VERE, Croydon, Retired Major Royal London Militia. Oct 3. Smith, Egham.
 LLOYD, RICE, Beaumaris, Anglesey, Ironmonger. Sept 20. Glynne & Co, Bangor.
 LONGBOTTOM, DAVID, Liverpool, Gent. Sept 12. Smith & Son, Liverpool.
 MOODY, THOMAS, Paddock, Huddersfield, Cabinet Maker. Sept 17. Brook, Huddersfield.
 OLDHAM, HENRY, Fladbury, Worcs, Esq. Sept 29. Field & Sons, Leamington.
 OXLEY, CAROLINE, Upper Clapton. Oct 1. Hughes & Co, New Broad st.
 PETMAN, THEODORA ALEXANDRINA, Portsdown rd, Maida Va'o. Oct 8. Geare, Lincoln's inn fields.
 RADCLIFF, WILLIAM, Quarndon, Derby, Gent. Sept 27. Briggs, Derby.
 RICHARDS, CHARLOTTE, Tilehurst, nr Reading. Sept 20. Roberts, Exeter.
 RIDOUT, HENRIETTA MARY, Wolverhampton. Oct 1. Thorne & Co, Wolverhampton.
 SUTTON, JOHN, Burton on Trent, Wood Ranger. Oct 1. Jennings & Co, Burton on Trent.
 TODD, WILLIAM JAMES, North Petherton, nr Bridgwater, Surgeon. Oct 19. Young & Son, Hastings.
 VOICE, SARAH, High rd, Kilburn, Milliner. Sept 21. Ryland & Wagborne, Cheltenham.
 WAGLAND, MARY, Royal Mews, Windsor Castle. Sept 20. Phillips & Randle, Ford, Windsor.
 WAITRES, JOHN, Belvedere, Bath, Clerk in Holy Orders. Sept 28. Simmons & Co, Bath.
 WILSON, JAMES, Marske in Cleveland, Yorks, Labourer. Oct 1. Thompson, Middlesborough.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Aug. 23.
 ALLEN, JOHN, Pilton, Somerset, Rate Collector. Sept 29. Bulleid, Glastonbury.
 BARKER, GEORGE, Conisbrough, Yorks, Manufacturer. Nov 20. Binney & Sons, Sheffield.
 BECK, HENRY ATTHILL, Lancaster rd, South Norwood, Gent. Sept 15. Plunkett & Leader, St Paul's Churchyd.
 BOWLER, MARY ANN, Winhill, Derby. Sept 26. Taylor, Burton on Trent.
 BROOKS, JANE, Norton Canes, nr Cannock, Staffs. Sept 21. Russell, Lichfield.
 BROWN, JOHN, the younger, King's Lynn, Master Mariner. Sept 29. Flint, Derby.
 COCKE, JOHN, Milton st, Cripplegate, Manufacturer. Oct 21. Plunkett & Leader, St Paul's Churchyd.
 CURRIE, EDWARD, Pickford Lodge, nr Ticehurst, Sussex, Esq. Sept 13. Hanbury & Co, New Broad st.
 CUTCLIFFE, ELIZA, Auckland hill, West Norwood. Oct 20. Greenfield & Cracknell, Lancaster pl, Strand.
 DENNY, MR EDWARD, Bart., The Grove, Boltons, West Brompton. Oct 31. F. & T. Guillaume, Salisbury sq.
 DIBLE, WILLIAM STEPHEN, Southampton, Boatman. Oct 5. Coxwell & Pope, Southampton.
 DYDE, JOHN, Elgin avenue, Harrow rd, Gent. Sept 30. Venn & Woodcock, New Inn, Strand.
 FALL, RICHARD, Acomb, Yorks, Gent. Sept 28. J. & R. Holtby, York.
 HERBING, NATHANIEL ROGERS, Westbourne pk crescent, Clerk in Holy Orders. Oct 15. Hare & Co, Temple chhrs, Whitefriars.
 HORSFALL, WRIGHT, Ovenden Wood, Halifax. Oct 1. Jubb & Co, Halifax.
 HUNT, EMMA, Aston New Town, Birmingham. Oct 3. Canning & Canning, Birmingham.
 LILFE, EMMA, Earl's Court rd, Kensington, Shopkeeper. Sept 14. Howard, Clifford's inn.
 KAY, GEORGE, Tinsley Park, nr Rotherham, Colliery Clerk. Oct 1. Oxley & Coward, Rotherham.
 LAWSON, DANIEL BROWN, Oxtow, Chester, Insurance Broker. Oct 1. Forshaw & Hawkins, Liverpool.
 LORD, EDWARD, Cornwell rd, Brixton Hill, Gent. Oct 1. Fenn, D'Albani, & Ellis, Newmarket.
 MAYNARD, FRANCIS, Brighton, Fishmonger. Sept 30. Stevens & Son, Brighton.
 MURGATROYD, JAMES, Friendly in Ovended, Halifax, retired Grocer. Oct 1. Jubb & Co, Halifax.
 PETRIE, ALEXANDER, Stockton on Tees, Shipowner. Sept 30. Willan & Cadle, Darlington.
 POWELL, THOMAS, Kelvedon, Essex, Farmer. Nov 1. Beaumont & Son, Coggeshall.
 PRESSOTT, ELIJAH, Wigan, Yeoman. Oct 1. Peace & Ellis, Wigan.
 RODGERS, JOHN LEARMONT, New st, Borough rd, Timber Dealer. Oct 14. T. & F. P. Baddeley, Lendenhall st.
 SLAGO, JOHN, Manchester. Sept 29. Stevenson & Co, Manchester.
 SMITH, ANN, Molesford rd, Parsons Green. Sept 30. Worrell, Coleman st.
 TEMPLE, GEORGE, Addiscombe, Croydon. Sept 29. Field & Sons, Leamington.
 TIFFIN, CAROLINE, Lewes. Sept 24. Algar, Abchurch lane.
 TOWSE, RICHARD, Horsham, Sussex, Licensed Victualler. Oct 2. Coole, Horsham.
 WEAVER, WILLIAM BOOLE, Highfields, Sheffield. Nov 1. Alderson & Co, Sheffield.
 WELFITT, SAMUEL WILLIAM, Lanwith Lodge, Notts, Esq. Oct 1. Goodall & Brown, Nottingham.
 WEST, GEORGE, Wavertree, Lancs, Corn Merchant. Oct 8. Hore & Co, Liverpool.
 WILSON, JOHN, Bradford, Gent. Sept 29. Atkinson, Bradford.

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS & LESSEES.—Before purchasing or renting a house have the Sanitary arrangements thoroughly examined by an expert from The Sanitary Engineering & Ventilation Co., 65, late 116, Victoria-st., Westminster (Estab. 1878), who also undertake the Ventilation of Offices, &c.—[ADVT.]

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Aug. 23.

ALDERD, WILLIAM, Padiham, Lancs, Weaver Burnley Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 ARCHER, FREDERICK, Long Eaton, Derbyshire, Commission Agent Derby Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 ATKINS, WILLIAM, Lower Crumpeall, Cheetham Hill, Lancs, Farmer Manchester Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 20.
 BAKER, HENRY JOHN, Woburn Sands, Bucks, Schoolmaster Northampton Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 BARRINGTON, HENRY EDWARD, Manchester, Yarn Agent Manchester Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 BARTLETT, GEORGE CRESSER, Neath, Glam, Market Gardener Neath Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 20.
 BELL, EDWARD THOMAS, Dover, Carpenter Canterbury Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 BISSELL, JOHN NAYLER, Carlisle, Schoolmaster Carlisle Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 20.
 BOOTH, THOMAS, Lowestoft, Snack Owner Great Yarmouth Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 BRAY, WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Fisherman Great Grimsby Pet Aug 17 Ord Aug 17.
 BRICE, EDWARD, Inchbrook, nr Stroud, Glos, Brassfounder Gloucester Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 20.
 BUSTON, WILLIAM, Bucklersbury, Physician High Court Pet Aug 8 Ord Aug 10.
 CHANTLER, DAVID, Boughton Malherbe, Kent, Cartiers Assistant Maidstone Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 COHEN, SAMUEL, Margate, Hairdresser Canterbury Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 20.
 DALE, SAMUEL, Bucknall, Staffs, Butty Collier Hanley, Burslem, and Tunstall Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 DAYRY, THOMAS, Mendlesham, Suffolk, Farmer Bury St Edmunds Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.

ENGLISH, THOMAS BARRY, Canterbury, Physician Canterbury Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 EVANS, THOMAS, Bagillt, Flintshire, Licensed Victualler Chester Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 FLANDERS, JOSEPH, Walton on the Naze, Essex, Grocer Colchester Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 FOX, GEORGE, Hemsworth, Yorks, Grocer Wakefield Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 FRITH, WILLIAM, Leicester, Grocer Leicester Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 HEYWOORTH, EDWIN, Burnley, Mechanic Burnley Pet Aug 7 Ord Aug 19.
 HIBT, GEORGE, Rawfold, Liversedge, Yorks, Tanner Dewsbury Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 IRELAND, THOMAS, Kighley, Tobaccoist Bradford Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 KITCH, WILLIAM, King st, Hammersmith, Grocer High Court Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 KOENIG, FREDERICK CHARLES HENRY, Redcliffe, Bristol, Pipe Merchant Bristol Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 LAW, JOHN, Stainland, nr Halifax, Farmer Halifax Pet Aug 10 Ord Aug 21.
 MAY, GEORGE THOMAS, Tunstall, Staffs, Surgeon Tunstall Pet Aug 29 Ord Aug 29.
 MEDWIN, WILLIAM, London wall, Carpet Planner, High Court Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 MOORING, GEORGE, Dunstable, Beds, Wheelwright Luton Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 20.
 MUNRO, JOHN, Portland rd, Finsbury pk, Commercial Traveller High Court Pet Aug 1 Ord Aug 19.
 NEWPORT, RICHARD, Haslinghale, Kent, Farmer Canterbury Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 O'PRAY, JOHN, Whitehaven, Innkeeper Whitehaven Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 PATON, ROBERT, Halifax, Draper Halifax Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 REES, WILLIAM JONES, Walton, nr Liverpool, Pawnbroker Liverpool Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 20.
 ROBSON, ROBERT JAMES, Gatehead, Grocer Newcastle on Tyne Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.

ROBINSON, THOMAS, Ulverston, Lancs, Butcher Ulverston Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 20.
 SAVAGE, ROBERT MATTHEW, Bagehot, Surrey, Grocer Kingston, Surrey Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 SHACKLETON, JOHN, Burnley, Joiner Burnley Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 SMITH, CHRISTOPHER, Fleetwood, Lancs, Tailor Preston Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 20.
 STRANKS, WILLIAM, Treorky, Glam, Confectioner Pontypridd Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 THIRTLE, ROBERT, Worstead, Norfolk, late Farmer Norwich Pet Aug 10 Ord Aug 19.
 TOMLIN, SYDNEY, Landport, Hants, Draper Portsmouth Pet Aug 17 Ord Aug 17.
 WARREN, THOMAS, Chadwell Heath, Dagenham, Essex, Jobber Chelmsford Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.
 WILLIAMS, JOHN, Havod, Glam, Mason Pontypridd Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 20.
 WILSON, FREDERICK JOHN, Cathay, Bristol, Watchmaker Bristol Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21.
 WILSON, THOMAS, Beverley, Yorks, Labourer Kingston upon Hull Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 20.
 WOOD, EDWIN, Bailey, Yorks, Dyer Dewsbury Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19.

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Aug. 20.

TURNBULL, EMILY CHARLES, Manchester, Draper Manchester Pet Aug 13 Ord Aug 15.

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED.

WILSON, ARTHUR HENRY, Seaforth, nr Liverpool, Cotton Broker Liverpool Resc Ord June 29 Resc Aug 24.

FIRST MEETINGS.

ARCHER, FREDERICK, Long Eaton, Derbyshire, Commission Agent Aug 30 at 3 Off Rec, 156 James's chhrs, Derby.
 ARMITAGE, HUTCHINSON, Sheriff Hutton, Yorks,

Grocer Aug 30 at 11.30 Off Rec, 74, Newborough st, Scarborough
 AUSTIN, WILLIAM JOHN, Leicester, Stonemason Aug 30 at 3 Off Rec, 28, Friar lane, Leicester
 BELL, EDWARD THOMAS, Dover, Carpenter Sept 2 at 4 Mowll & Mowll, 65, Castle st, Dover
 BENTLEY, ROBERT ALBERT, and ARTHUR ALFRED BENTLEY, Leicester, Boot Manufacturers Sept 2 at 12.30 Off Rec, 28, Friar lane, Leicester
 BIDDLECOMBE, ALEXANDER, Bevois Mount, Southampton, Builder Sept 3 at 11 Off Rec, 4, East st, Southampton
 BISSILL, JOHN NAYLER, Carlisle, Schoolmaster Aug 31 at 10 Off Rec, 31, Fisher st, Carlisle
 BRIGGS, DAVID, and JOSEPH DIXON WATERHOUSE Hunslet, Leeds, Cloth Manufacturers Sept 3 at 3 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
 BROWN, GEORGE, Manchester, Merchant Aug 30 at 3 Off Rec, Ogden's chhrs, Bridge st, Manchester
 BOTT, HENRY, Nottingham, Builder Aug 30 at 11 Off Rec, 1, High pavement, Nottingham
 CAPON, JAMES, Orpington, Kent, Fruit Grower Sept 2 at 12 119, Victoria st, Westminster
 CAVNER, RICHARD, New Evington, Leicestershire, Fish Salesman Aug 30 at 12.30 Off Rec, 28, Friar lane, Leicester
 COOK, FREDERICK AUGUSTUS KIRKE, Taunton, Fish Dealer Aug 30 at 11.30 W. J. Villar, 10, Hammett st, Taunton
 COOKSON, THOMAS HENRY, Colne, Lancs, Fish Dealer Oct 3 at 1.30 Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley
 EGGLESTON, HENRY, Belle Vue, nr Wakefield, Miner Aug 30 at 11 Off Rec, Bond ter, Wakefield
 EIDGE, PATER, Rhyl, Flintshire, Cattle Dealer Sept 2 at 2.30 Bankruptcy Office, Crypt chhrs, Chester
 EDWARDS, WILLIAM, Bangor, Carnarvonshire Licensed Victualler Sept 3 at 1 Queen's Head Cafe, Bangor
 FARROW, GEORGE, sen, Spennithorne, Yorks, Farmer Sept 5 at 11 North Eastern Hotel, Darlington
 FOX, GEORGE, Huddersfield, Yorks, Grocer Aug 30 at 12 Off Rec, Bond terrace, Wakefield
 FRITH, WILLIAM, Leicester, Grocer Sept 2 at 3 Off Rec, 28, Friar lane, Leicester
 GOULD, ANNA MARIA, and EMMA GOULD, Purewell, Christchurch, S. Southampton, Spicers Aug 30 at 1 Salisbury Arms, Purewell, Christchurch
 GRACE, ANNIE CLODE, Warrington, Potter Aug 30 at 11.30 Court house, Upper Bank st, Warrington
 GRIFFITH, ROBERT, Penrhoslligwy, Anglesey, Farmer Sept 3 at 12.15 Queen's Head Cafe, Bangor
 HARRIS, EDWARD, and CHARLES TURNER, Wallase, Bricklayers Sept 2 at 11.15 Off Rec, Wallase
 HENHAM, IDEN, Hastings, Saddler Aug 30 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn
 HEPBURN, GEORGE, Woking, Surrey, Coal Dealer Aug 30 at 11 No 16 Room, 30 and 31, St Swithun's lane
 HEWITT, WILLIAM, Sheffield, late Farmer Aug 31 at 12 The Law Society, 45, Bank st, Sheffield
 HILBERT, ALBERT and RALPH OPPENHEIM, Old Kent rd, Timber Merchants Sept 4 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 HITT, EMMA, Weymouth, Schoolmistress Sept 3 at 3 Off Rec's Offices, Salisbury
 IRELAND, THOMAS, Keighley, Yorks, Tobacconist Sept 4 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
 ISAACS, A. H., Gloucester crescent, Westbourne Park Sept 5 at 11 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields
 KAIKEL, JOHN WILLIAM Plough rd, Battersea, Baker Sept 2 at 3 119, Victoria st, Westminster
 LAW, JOHN, Stainland, nr Halifax, Farmer Sept 2 at 2 Off Rec, Halifax
 MACEVOY, FRANCIS, Burnley, Clothes Dealer Aug 30 at 3 Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley
 MOSS, ISAAC, Connaught st, Florist Sept 4 at 12 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
 O'MALLEY, JAMES, Liverpool, late Master Butcher Sept 6 at 12 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 PATON, ROBERT, Halifax, Draper Sept 2 at 3 Off Rec, Halifax
 PEAKE, THOMAS BRITTEN, Balsall Heath, King's Norton, Worcs, Baker Sept 3 at 3 25, Colmore row, Birmingham
 PLUMMER, JOHN EDWARD, Leeds, Worsted Coating Manufacturer Sept 3 at 3.30 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
 PRICE, WILLIAM, the Pavement, Clapham, Mercantile Clerk Aug 30 at 3 119, Victoria st, Westminster
 ROBINSON, FREDERICK, Church st, Fulham rd, Provision Dealer Sept 5 at 12 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
 ROBERT, ROBERT JAMES, Gateshead, Grocer Sept 3 at 2.30 Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
 ROIAL, MATTHEW, New Clec, Lincs, Fisherman Sept 3 at 11 Off Rec, 3, Haven st, Gt Grimsby
 SAVAGE, EDWARD, Swindon, Wilts, Coachbuilder Aug 30 at 11.30 Off Rec, 32, High st, Swindon
 SNOW, WILLIAM, Wharton st, Foreman of the Works, London Central Market, Smithfield Sept 5 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn
 TOMLIN, SYDNEY, Landport, Draper Sept 2 at 4 163, Queen st, Portico
 TURNBULL, EMILY CLARISSE, Manchester, Draper Sept 2 at 3 Off Rec, Ogden's chhrs, Bridge st, Manchester
 WALKER, FRANCIS WILLIAM HOWARD, late of Margate, Brewer's Agent Aug 30 at 4 53, High st, Margate
 WHITNEY, JOHN, Keighley, Yorks, General Dealer Aug 30 at 12.30 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
 WITCHELL, JOSEPH BROWN, Cirencester, Commercial Traveller Aug 30 at 2 Off Rec, 32, High st, Swindon
 WOOD, ELLIS, Hunslet, Leeds, Dyer Sept 3 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds

WOODS, ALBERT W. St George's rd, Pimlico, Rouge Dragon at the College of Arms Sept 4 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn
 WOODS, EDWIN, Batley, Yorks, Dyer Aug 30 at 4 Off Rec, Bank chhrs, Batley

ADJUDICATIONS.

ALDRID, WILLIAM, Padstow, Lancs, Weaver Burnley Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19
 ARCHER, FREDERICK Long Eaton, Derbyshire, Commission Agent Derby Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19
 ASHWELL, WILLIAM, Dewsbury, Stationer Dewsbury Pet July 30 Ord Aug 20
 AUSTIN, WILLIAM JOHN, Leicester, Stonemason Leicester Pet Aug 16 Ord Aug 20
 BELL, EDWARD THOMAS, Dover, Carpenter Canterbury Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19
 BENTLEY, ROBERT ALBERT, and ARTHUR ALFRED BENTLEY, Leicester, Boot Manufacturers Leicester Pet Aug 16 Ord Aug 20
 BISSILL, JOHN NAYLER, Carlisle, Schoolmaster Carlisle Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 20
 BOOTY, THOMAS, Lowestoft, Smackowner Gt Yarmouth Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19
 BRAY, WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Fisherman Gt Grimsby Pet Aug 17 Ord Aug 17
 BRICE, EDWARD, Inchbrook, nr Stroud, Glos, Brass Founder Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 21
 BULLOCK, CHARLES WILLIAM, Egremont, Cheshire, American Money Changer Liverpool Pet Aug 2 Ord Aug 21
 CAVNER, RICHARD, New Evington, Leices, Fish Salesman Leicester Pet Aug 16 Ord Aug 20
 COHEN, SAMUEL, Margate, Haidresser Canterbury Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 20
 DALE, SAMUEL, Bucknall, Staffs, Butty Collier Hanley, Burslem, and Tunstall Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19
 DARNELL, WILLIAM, Louth, Lincs, Journeyman Saddler Great Grimsby Pet July 30 Ord Aug 17
 DAVEY, THOMAS, Mendlesham, Suffolk, Farmer Bury St Edmunds Pet Aug 17 Ord Aug 19
 DAVIS, GEORGE, London rd ter, Enfield, Furniture Dealer Edmonton Pet Aug 16 Ord Aug 20
 ENGLISH, THOMAS BARRY, Canterbury, Physician Canterbury Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21
 EVANS, THOMAS, Bagillt, Flintshire, Licensed Victualler Chester Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19
 EVATT, HENRY, Leicester, Milliner Leicester Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19
 FANSHAW, HENRY, Rhyl, Flintshire, Commercial Traveller Bangor Pet May 17 Ord Aug 19
 FLANDERS, JOSEPH, Walton on the Naze, Essex, Grocer Colchester Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21
 GRIFFITH, ROBERT, Penrhoslligwy, Anglesey, Farmer Bangor Pet July 23 Ord Aug 19
 HOLROYD, JOHN, Morley, Yorks, Overlooker Dewsbury Pet Aug 15 Ord Aug 20
 IRELAND, THOMAS, Keighley, Yorks, Tobacconist Bradford Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 21
 ISAACS, A. H., Gloucester crescent, Westbourne pk, High Court Pet June 21 Ord Aug 21
 JENNINGS, WILLIAM JOHN, Tysoe st, Wilmington sq, Clerkenwell, Working Jeweller High Court Pet Aug 15 Ord Aug 21
 KEMP, JOHN THOMAS, St Ann's rd, Burdett rd, Mile end, formerly Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Aug 14 Ord Aug 21
 KITCH, WILLIAM, King st, Hammersmith, Grocer High Court Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19
 KORNNE, FREDERICK CHARLES HENRY, Bristol, Pipe Merchant Bristol Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21
 MACEVOY, FRANCIS, Burnley, Clothes Dealer Burnley Pet July 25 Ord Aug 20
 MERRILLS, ARTHUR, Liverpool, Printer Liverpool Pet July 11 Ord Aug 21
 NEWPORT, RICHARD, Hastings, Kent, Farmer Canterbury Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 21
 ONSBORN, CHARLES, Hove, Sussex, Builder Brighton Pet Aug 10 Ord Aug 20
 PALMER, E., Sydney rd, Turnpike lane, Hornsey, late Grocer High Court Pet July 9 Ord Aug 19
 PATON, ROBERT, Halifax, Draper Halifax Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19
 PEAKE, THOMAS BRITTEN, Balsall Heath, King's Norton, Worcester Baker Pet July 27 Ord Aug 21
 SAVAGE, ROBERT MATTHEW, Bagshot, Surrey, Grocer Kingston, Surrey Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 21
 SHACKLETON, JOHN, Burnley, Joiner Burnley Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21
 WILLIAMS, ROSETTA, late Cornwall terr, Regent's pk, Spinster High Court Pet July 12 Ord Aug 19
 WILSON, THOMAS, Beverley, Yorks, Labourer Kingston on Hull Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 20
 WOOD, EDWIN, Batley, Yorks, Dyer Dewsbury Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 20

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, August 27.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ALEWOOD, EDWIN, Swansea, Chemist Swansea Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23
 ARNOTT, MONKMAN, Scarborough, Joiner Scarborough Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23
 ASHWORTH, HENRY, and JOSEPH ASHWORTH, Walsden, nr Todmorden, Lancs, Cotton Manufacturers Burnley Pet Aug 8 Ord Aug 22
 BLOOM, ISRAEL, Swansea, Cabinet Maker Swansea Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19
 BOLDING, WILLIAM FREDERICK, Sidley, Bexhill on Sea, Sussex, Farmer Hastings Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23
 BROOK, GEORGE, Ossett, Yorks, Rag Merchant Dewsbury Pet Aug 13 Ord Aug 13
 BURWELL, WILLIAM HENRY, Midhurst, Sussex, Grocer Brighton Pet Aug 24 Ord Aug 24
 CHATTELL, HARRY FRANK, Hollingworth, Cheshire, Joiner Ashton under Lyne and Stalybridge Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23

COOK, BRYAN GEORGE DAVIES, Colomendy, Denbighshire, Quarry Proprietor Chester Pet July 19 Ord Aug 21
 DAVID, WILLIAM, Swansea, Journeyman Mason Swansea Pet Aug 22 Ord Aug 22
 DE TORRES, WILLIAM, Cardiff, Tailor Cardiff Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 22
 DODD, JAMES, Exeter, Innkeeper Exeter Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 21
 DYSON, MARY ALICE, and JANE DYSON, Halifax, Cloth Brokers Halifax Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23
 ELD, ALBERT, West Bromwich, Cricket Outfitter West Bromwich Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 23
 ELMORE, RICHARD, Cambridge grdns, Notting hill, Artist High Court Pet Aug 7 Ord Aug 23
 GATH, ELLEN, Bishopston, Bristol, Widow Bristol Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23
 GRAHAM, DENNY, Globe Wharf, Canal Bridge, Old Kent rd, China Dealer High Court Pet Aug 6 Ord Aug 23
 GUNNELL, WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Saddler Great Grimsby Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23
 HANSELL, RICHARD ALEXANDER, Sheffield, Manufacturer of Steel Castings Sheffield Pet Aug 22 Ord Aug 22
 HILLS, ALFRED, and WALTER TOWNSEND, Church st, Camberwell, Ironmongers High Court Pet Aug 3 Ord Aug 23
 HOLMAN, HORACE, East Ardsley, Yorks, Butcher Wakefield Pet Aug 24 Ord Aug 24
 HOWELLS, THOMAS SAMUEL, Landore, Swansea, Grocer Swansea Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21
 HOYLE, TOM, Southill, nr Dewsbury, Timber Merchant Dewsbury Pet Aug 12 Ord Aug 22
 JAY, PHILIP STAFFORD, Hitchin, Herts, Draper Luton Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21
 JODE, WILLIAM LOVEMACE, Sutton, Surrey, Fancy Stationer Croydon Pet Aug 24 Ord Aug 24
 McDONAGH, JAMES SAMUEL, Clement's inn, Strand, Doctor of Medicine High Court Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23
 McEWEN, THOMAS GEORGE, the Grove, Stratford, Market 20, Carmen High Court Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23
 PARKER, HENRY, Seaton, Devon, Builder Exeter Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23
 PENDLETON, JAMES, Liverpool, Ironfounder Liverpool Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23
 POTTER, HENRY, Loughton, Essex, Farmer Edmonton Pet Aug 22 Ord Aug 24
 POWELL, LAWRENCE, Stockport, Screwing Tackle Manufacturer Stockport Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 23
 RAMSDEN, JOHN, Leeds, Worsted Coating Manufacturer Leeds Pet Aug 12 Ord Aug 23
 SPENCER, ARTHUR WILLIAM, Derby, Joiner Derby Pet Aug 22 Ord Aug 23
 STEVENS, ANDREW LEAH, Penryn, Budock, Cornwall, Grocer Truro Pet Aug 22 Ord Aug 21
 STOTT, JOHN, Buxton, Nurseryman Stockport Pet Aug 22 Ord Aug 22
 TAYLOR, CLEMENT, Northwich, Cheshire, Stock Broker Nantwich and Crewe Pet Aug 10 Ord Aug 22
 WARREN, WILLIAM, Lelant, nr Hayle, Cornwall, Insurance Agent Truro Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 22
 WILSON, WILLIAM GEORGE, Heaton, Newcastle on Tyne, Manufacturer Newcastle on Tyne Pet Aug 14 Ord Aug 24
 WOOD, JOHN ROBERT, Epworth, Lincs, Courier Sheffield Pet Aug 9 Ord Aug 21

FIRST MEETINGS.

ADAMSON, CHARLES RALPH, Lowestoft, Baker Sept 14 at 11.45 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
 ALDRID, WILLIAM, Padstow, Lancs, Weaver Oct 3 at 2 Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley
 ALLEN, ROBERT, Bishop's Lydeard, Somerset, Yeoman Sept 3 at 11.30 W. J. Villar, 10, Hammett st, Taunton
 ATKES, WILLIAM, Lower Crumppall, Cheetham Hill, Lancs, Farmer Sept 5 at 12 Off Rec, Ogden's chhrs, Bridge st, Manchester
 BANKS, WILLIAM HENRY, Regina rd, Tollington Park, Zincworker Sept 10 at 12 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields
 BARRAH, MATTHEW, Wednesbury, Grocer Sept 4 at 3.30 Off Rec, Colmore rd, Birmingham
 BARTLETT, GEORGE CHESLER, Neath, Glam, Market Gardener Sept 17 at 1.30 Castle Hotel, Neath
 BLOOM, ISRAEL, Swansea, Cabinet Maker Sept 20 at 12.30 Off Rec, 95, Oxford st, Swansea
 BOOTY, THOMAS, Lowestoft, Smackowner Sept 14 at 12 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
 BRAY, WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Fisherman Sept 3 at 12 Off Rec, 3, Haven st, Gt Grimsby
 BRICE, EDWARD, Inchbrook, nr Stroud, Glos, Brass-founder Sept 3 at 4 Railway Hotel, Nailsworth, Gloucestershire
 BROOKS, HERBERT FRANCIS, Gt Yarmouth, Shipbroker Sept 14 at 12.15 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
 BRYANT, JOSEPH, Dartmouth Park hill, Highgate, Butcher Sept 10 at 11 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
 BRYCE, FRANCIS JOHN, Brierley Hill, Staffs, Boat-builder Sept 10 at 2.30 Thomas Wall, Solicitor, Bournebridge
 BULTON, FRANK WALTER, Kidderminster, Bootdealer Sept 9 at 12.30 Roden & Dawes, Solicitors, Kidderminster
 CHANTLER, DAVID, Boughton Malherbe, Kent, Carrier's Assistant Sept 26 at 12.30 Off Rec, Week st, Maidstone
 CLAPSON, EDWARD THOMAS, Tunbridge Wells, Baker Sept 5 at 2.30 Spencer & Reeves, Mount Pleasant, Tunbridge Wells
 COHAN, MOSES LEOPOLD, Tavistock sq, Gent Sept 6 at 12 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn

COOKE, SAMUEL GRIFFIN, Kidderminster, Butcher Sept 9 at 12.45 Roden & Dawes, Solicitors, Kidderminster

DALE, SAMUEL, Bucknall, Staffs, Butty Collier Sept 6 at 12 Off Rec, Newcastle under Lyme

DIARNELL, WILLIAM, Louth, Lincs, Journeyman Saddler Sept 3 at 12.30 Off Rec, 3, Haven st, Gt Grimsby.

DAVEY, THOMAS, Mendlesham, Suffolk, Farmer Sept 3 at 12.15 Off Rec, Ipswich

DAVID, WILLIAM, Swansea, Journeyman Mason Sept 20 at 12 Off Rec, 98, Oxford st, Swansea

DODD, JAMES, Exeter, Innkeeper Sept 4 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Bedford circus, Exeter

DUFF, DAVID, Manchester, Jute Merchant Sept 3 at 11.30 Off Rec, Ogden's chbrs, Bridge st, Manchester

DYSON, MARY ALICE, and JANE DYSON, Halifax, Clothes Brokers Sept 4 at 10 Off Rec, Halifax

EVANS, THOMAS, Bagillt, Flintshire, Licensed Victualler Sept 6 at 2.30 Bankruptcy Office, Croyd chbrs, Chester

EVANS, WILLIAM, Wicklowood, Norfolk, Farmer Sept 14 at 10.00 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich

FRANCE, JOHN WILLIAM, Sheffield, Wire Worker Sept 4 at 3.30 Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield

GATBILL, JAMES, Weelsby, Clee, Lincs, Musician Sept 3 at 11.30 Off Rec, 3, Haven st, Great Grimsby

GOULD, JAMES, Northwold, Norfolk, Bricklayer Sept 14 at 11 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich

GREEN, WALTER BURTON, Eastbourne, late Theatrical Lessee Sept 4 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn

HARLING, WILLIAM FRANCIS, Rodney ter, Lower Richmond rd, Putney, Builder Sept 5 at 12 119, Victoria st, Westminster

HEYWORTH, EDWIN, Burnley, Mechanic Oct 3 at 2.30 Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley

HOLMES, JOHN, sen, Freiton, Lincs, Farmer Sept 5 at 12 Off Rec, 45, High st, Boston

HIRST, GEORGE, Liversedge, Yorks, Tanner Sept 4 at 3 Off Rec, Bank chbrs, Batley

HOWELL, THOMAS SAMUEL, Landore, Swansea, Grocer Sept 20 at 11.30 Off Rec, 98, Oxford st, Swansea

HOYLE, TOM, Southill, nr Batley, Yorks, Timber Merchant Sept 4 at 11 Off Rec, Bank chbrs, Batley

HUGHES, WILLIAM JAMES, Walton, Liverpool, Builder Sept 26 at 12.15 Townhall, Aberystwith

LAWSON, GEORGE STODART, Goring, Sussex, Nurseryman Sept 3 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton

MAY, GEORGE THOMAS, Tunstall, Staffs, Surgeon Sept 6 at 3.45 Off Rec, Newcastle under Lyme

NORTHCOOT, JOHN EDWARD, Manchester, Insurance Agent Sept 5 at 11.30 Off Rec, Ogden's chbrs, Bridge st, Manchester

NOTLEY, ALBERT, Cardiff, Commission Agent Sept 12 at 3 Off Rec, 29, Queen st, Cardiff

O'PRAY, JOHN, Whitehaven, Innkeeper Sept 6 at 12 67, Duke st, Whitehaven

POWER, LAWRENCE, Stockport, Screwing Tackle Manufacturer Sept 5 at 12 Off Rec, County chbrs, Market pl, Stockport

RICHES, JOSIAH, Stalham, Norfolk, Coal Dealer Sept 14 at 11.15 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich

ROBERTS, ROBERT, Llanrhydydd, Carnarvonshire, Innkeeper Sept 17 at 12.45 Market hall, Blaenau Ffestiniog

SHACKLETON, JOHN, Burnley, Joiner Sept 4 at 3 Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley

SMITH, CHRISTOPHER, Fleetwood, Lancs, Tailor Sept 3 at 2 Off Rec, Ogden's chbrs, Bridge st, Manchester

SPENCER, SARAH ANN, Ripon, Yorks, Milliner Sept 6 at 12 Unicorn Hotel, Ripon

SPENCER, ARTHUR WILLIAM, Derby, Joiner Sept 4 at 11 Off Rec, St James's chbrs, Derby

STOTT, JOHN, Buxton, Nurseryman Sept 5 at 11.30 Off Rec, County chbrs, Market place, Stockport

SWINEBANK, JOSEPH THOMAS POTTEE, Stockton on Tees, Painter Sept 3 at 11 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough

TAYLOR, CLEMENT, Northwich, Cheshire, Stockbroker Sept 12 at 11 Royal Hotel, Crewe

THIRTELL, ROBERT, Worstead, Norfolk, late Farmer Sept 4 at 11.20 Off Rec, 8 King st, Norwich

WARD, JOHN, Endlesham rd, Nightingale lane, Bulham Sept 5 at 3 119, Victoria st, Westminster

WARREN, WILLIAM, Lelant, nr Hayle, Cornwall, Insurance Agent Sept 3 at 12 Off Rec, Boscawen st, Truro

WILLIAMS, ANNA JANE, and ELIZABETH MARY WILLIAMS, Haverfordwest, Drapers Sept 3 at 11 Off Rec, 11, Quay st, Carmarthen

WIDSON, WILLIAM GEORGE, Heaton, Newcastle on Tyne, Manufacturer Sept 7 at 11 Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne

ADJUDICATIONS.

BEAL, JOHN JAMES, Leicester, Timber Merchant Leicester Pet Aug 8 Ord Aug 23

BLOOM, ISRAEL, Swansea, Cabinet Maker Swansea Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 19

BURRIDGE, THOMAS, Winterborne Abbas, Dorset, Farmer Dorchester Pet Aug 6 Ord Aug 21

DODD, JAMES, Exeter, Innkeeper Exeter Pet Aug 19 Ord Aug 22

DUFF, DAVID, Manchester, Jute Merchant Manchester Pet July 23 Ord Aug 23

DYSON, MARY ALICE, and JANE DYSON, Halifax, Clothes Brokers Halifax Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23

ELD, ALBERT, West Bromwich, Cricket Outfitter West Bromwich Pet Aug 16 Ord Aug 23

GUNNELL, WILLIAM, Great Grimsby, Saddler Great Grimsby Pet Aug 23 Ord Aug 23

HARLING, WILLIAM FRANCIS, Rodney ter, Lower Richmond rd, Putney, Builder Wandsworth Pet July 24 Ord Aug 22

HEPBURN, GEORGE, Woking, Surrey, Coal Dealer Guildford and Godalming Pet July 23 Ord Aug 22

HEYWORTH, EDWIN, Burnley, Mechanic Burnley Pet Aug 7 Ord Aug 22

HILLMAN, WILLIAM, Newbold, nr Chesterfield, Civil Engineer Chesterfield Pet July 25 Ord Aug 22

HOLMAN, HORACE, East Ardsley, Yorks, Butcher Wakefield Pet Aug 24 Ord Aug 24

HOWELL, THOMAS SAMUEL, Landore, Swansea, Grocer Swansea Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21

HUGHES, WILLIAM JAMES, Walton, Liverpool, Builder Aberystwith Pet July 4 Ord Aug 22

JAY, PHILIP STAFFORD, Hitchin, Herts, Draper Luton Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21

JODE, WILLIAM LOVELACE, Sutton, Surrey, Fancy Stationer Croydon Pet Aug 24 Ord Aug 24

KAY, JOHN HENRY, Aldershot, Private in the Devonshire Regiment Blackburn Pet June 12 Ord Aug 22

LAW, JOHN, Stainland, nr Halifax, Farmer Halifax Pet Aug 10 Ord Aug 23

LAWSON, GEORGE STODART, Goring, Sussex, Nurseryman Brighton Pet Aug 2 Ord Aug 24

MC EWEN, THOMAS GEORGE, The Grove, Stratford, Manager to Carmen High Court Pet Aug 22 Ord Aug 23

MURRELL, WILLIAM CHARLES, Dockhead and Murrell's Wharf, Bermondsey Wall, Coal Factor High Court Pet July 15 Ord Aug 22

O'PRAY, JOHN, Whitehaven, Innkeeper Whitehaven Pet Aug 31 Ord Aug 23

POWER, LAWRENCE, Stockport, Screwing Tackle Manufacturers Stockport Pet Aug 22 Ord Aug 22

PUGH, WILLIAM VALENTINE, Nether Stowey, Somerset, Civil Engineer Bridgwater Pet July 19 Ord Aug 22

SPENCER, ARTHUR WILLIAM, Derby, Joiner Derby Pet Aug 22 Ord Aug 23

STEVENS, ANDREW LEAH, Penryn, Budock, Cornwall, Grocer Truro Pet Aug 24 Ord Aug 24

TAYLOR, CLEMENT, Northwich, Cheshire, Stockbroker Northwich and Crewe Pet Aug 10 Ord Aug 21

THIRTELL, ROBERT, Worstead, Norfolk, late Farmer Norwich Pet Aug 10 Ord Aug 24

WARD, EDWIN THOMAS, Handsworth, late Timber Merchant West Bromwich Pet July 20 Ord Aug 23

WARREN, WILLIAM, Lelant, nr Hayle, Cornwall, Insurance Agent Truro Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 21

WILLIAMS, ANNA JANE, and ELIZABETH MARY WILLIAMS, Haverfordwest, Drapers Pembroke Dock Pet Aug 13 Ord Aug 23

WILLIAMS, JOHN, Hafod, nr Pontypridd, Glam, Mason Pontypridd Pet Aug 20 Ord Aug 21

WILSON, FREDERICK JOHN, Bristol, Watchmaker Bristol Pet Aug 21 Ord Aug 22

SALE OF ENSUING WEEK.

Sept. 5.—Messrs. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD, at the Mart, E.C., at 2 o'clock, Reversions, Annuities, Policies, &c. (see advertisement this week, page 4).

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS	693
THE RIGHT TO THE POSSESSION AND PRODUCTION OF DEEDS	695
HOW TO PREPARE A DEBTOR'S STATEMENT OF AFFAIRS IN BANKRUPTCY	696
LIMITATION TO WIFE'S NEXT OF KIN	697
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	699
NEW ORDERS, &c.	699
LEGAL NEWS	700
WINDING-UP NOTICES	701
CREDITORS' NOTICES	701
BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	701
PUBLIC GENERAL STATUTES	701

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance include Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s. 6d. Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE  MAKERS,

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY AND CLERGY GOWNS

ESTABLISHED 1832.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

THE LAW GUARANTEE & TRUST SOCIETY, LIMITED.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL, £1,000,000.

PAID-UP CAPITAL, £100,000.

HEAD OFFICE: 9, Serle-street, Lincoln's-inn, London.

General Manager and Secretary, THOS. R. RONALD.

The Hon. BARON POLLOCK.
The Hon. Mr. JUSTICE KAY.

TRUSTEES:

The Hon. Mr. JUSTICE DAY.
The Hon. Mr. JUSTICE GRANTHAM.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY:

I.—FIDELITY GUARANTEES, given on behalf of Clerks, Cashiers, Travellers, and others; also Bonds on behalf of Trustees in Bankruptcy, Liquidators and Receivers under the High Court, and all persons holding Government appointments, where required; and

A.—LUNACY COMMITTEES' BONDS granted.

II.—ADMINISTRATION BONDS entered into at moderate rates.

III.—MORTGAGE INSURANCES effected.

IV.—DEBENTURES and BANK DEPOSITS guaranteed.

V.—TRUSTEES FOR DEBENTURE, &c. The Society acts as Trustee for Debenture and other Loans.

VI.—TRUSTEESHIP. The Society is also prepared to be appointed Trustee either in existing Trusts or in those to be hereafter created. (See special Prospectus.)

VII.—TITLES GUARANTEED (against defect in same).

VIII.—CONTRACTS GUARANTEED (as to due performance)

For further particulars apply to the Head Office, as above, or to any of the Branches:—
CITY: 9, St. Mildred's-court, Poultry, E.C. MANCHESTER: 51, King-street. LIVERPOOL: 6, York-buildings, 14, Dale-street. EDINBURGH: 53, George-street.

all,
rd
BY
ke
am,
ker

the
lies,
4).

the
ated

. 693
N
.. 695
OF
.. 696
.. 697
.. 698
.. 699
.. 700
.. 701
.. 702
... 703

NAL is
h the
advances
Sub-
at the
A.
ing the
try, it
e direct

ERS,

Whole of
on, &c.

REGISTER

a Clerks.

Y DOWNS

DON.

TY,

s as Trustee
nted Trustee
(us.)

erge-street.